

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATION THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW

Merle G. Richard
 Ralph G. Kregoski
 William H. Beckett
 Mercer R. Smith
 Donald J. Hallameyer
 John S. Perrin
 Philip J. Keleher
 Gerald D. Allen
 Gene M. Badgley
 Richard S. Togerson
 George E. Petro
 Samuel F. Martin
 John E. Purvis
 Ralph M. Head
 Gilbert A. Barrett
 Darwin B. Pond, Jr.
 Edwin T. Carlton
 Paul N. Taylor
 Samuel E. Helm, Jr.
 Marvin L. Berg
 Joseph T. Murphy
 Harvy C. Hinkel
 Emidio Briganti
 John McCabe
 Walter J. Klimek
 Charles R. Leutz, Jr.
 Allen R. Semb
 John F. Sutkus
 Wayne E. Wolcott
 Kenneth T. Dykes
 "W" "C" Hall
 Roy J. Leite, Jr.
 Samuel G. Beal
 John S. Bostwick
 Edgar P. Holt
 Edward M. Fleming
 Alfred F. McCaleb, Jr.
 Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
 Walter D. Phillips, Jr.
 Ernest W. Payne
 Robert W. Allen
 Bennett W. Alford
 Paul A. Schmuck, Jr.
 John H. Thomas
 Goodwin C. Groff
 James W. Bateman
 William R. Gould
 Norman C. Wiley
 Arthur O. Schmagel
 Leroy A. Seipp
 John W. Sullivan
 Richard A. Winters, Jr.
 Charles H. Coppedge
 Samuel "J" Griffin
 Robert F. Marr
 Edward D. Smith
 Harrel K. Jobe
 Robert W. Shirley
 Edwin Pendrey
 George S. Mansfield
 William J. Halligan
 Richard A. Ward
 Charles A. Salser
 Albert Fowler
 Stone W. Quillian
 Charles F. Disney
 Harold W. Hawkins
 Grady W. Ray
 Nicholas J. Dennis
 Donald E. Francke
 Charles H. Gould
 Lynn F. Williams
 Howard Ferguson, Jr.
 Harry B. Hanson
 Kenneth E. Huntington
 Frank K. Reilly, Jr.
 Roland S. Helstrom
 George H. Albers
 Norman R. Reichwald
 Jesse R. Crone
 William A. Danckaert
 Elmer Amundson
 John W. Johnson
 Donald Conroy
 Bertram "E" Cook, Jr.
 Jerry B. Smith

Richard C. Andrews
 Bill E. Horner
 George A. Phillips
 Arthur W. Ecklund
 William E. Register
 Lee R. Miller
 Edward H. Walker
 Paul W. Seabaugh
 George H. Cearley, Jr.
 Owen G. Jackson, Jr.
 Elmer J. Zorn
 James D. Johnson, Jr.
 John N. Snapper
 Wilbur O. Nelson
 Philip A. Davis
 Daniel G. Murray
 George W. Parker
 Charles T. Caldwell
 William P. Brown, Jr.
 Frank J. O'Hara, Jr.
 Dale L. Ward
 Russell A. Andres
 John DeCloud
 Arthur W. Newendorp
 Byron C. Allison
 John M. Jagoda
 Thomas A. Gribbin II
 Albert A. Grasselli
 George J. Collins
 George E. Moutzakis
 Charles W. Egan
 Charles E. Boswell, Jr.
 Ralph P. Ward, Jr.
 Robert L. Smith
 Leland C. Ritter
 Merlin L. Dake
 Charles R. Howe
 Eugene W. Meyer
 John J. Fischer
 Jack A. Miller
 Kenneth G. Fiegner
 Donald A. Panska
 Charles C. Angle
 Guy M. Washburn
 Lenhew E. Lovette
 Richard J. Sullivan
 Robert F. Warren
 Roderick J. Munro
 Henry G. Holmes, Jr.
 Ruel H. Corley, Jr.
 Harry F. Painter
 John M. McLaurin, Jr.
 Urban A. Lees
 William Bradford
 Clarence H. Schmid
 Bernard J. Stender
 Charles D. Dawkins, Jr.
 Thomas E. Cooney
 Lewis E. Bolts
 Donald P. Mileson
 Oliver J. Koester
 Ward L. Hooper
 Robert B. Robinson
 Lawrence R. Denham
 Alexander Wilson
 Robert D. Green
 Dwain L. Redalen
 Jefferson A. Davis, Jr.
 Robert J. Wright
 Harold G. McRay
 Kenneth L. Anstock
 Russell G. Patterson, Jr.
 Richard B. Newport
 Cornelius T. Montgomery, Jr.
 Harvey E. Wendt
 Harry O. Taylor
 Robert J. Graham
 Varge G. Frisbie
 John P. McMahon, Jr.
 Jack H. Hagler
 James W. Ferris
 Robert King, Jr.
 Roland B. Hellman
 Henry J. Jadrich
 William L. Atwater, Jr.
 Walter E. Daniel

Daniel P. Githens, Jr.
 Forrest "I" Townsend
 William H. Bortz, Jr.
 Harry G. C. Henneberger
 William Whitehill
 Earl A. Trager, Jr.
 William P. Brown
 Robert "J" Zitznik
 Arnold W. Barden
 William H. Roley
 Don G. Derryberry
 Crawford B. Malone
 John J. Hill III
 George Mottl
 Joseph B. DeHaven
 Dan C. Holland
 Sylvester F. Leis
 James E. Meehan
 William R. Lucas
 Robert E. McCarville
 Walter N. Roark, Jr.

John O. Kaylor
 Richard H. Peacock
 Thomas E. Mulvihill
 Otis R. Waldrop
 Clark Ashton
 Thomas H. Hughes
 Casimir C. Kyscewski
 William J. Peter, Jr.
 Donald S. McClellan
 Joseph F. Kirby, Jr.
 Elmer F. Koehler
 John L. Greene
 Dail D. Fine
 Kenneth L. Fellows
 Judson J. Bradway
 Dennis E. Byrd
 Raymond H. W. Pett
 "J", "E" Wellman
 Herbert N. Rapson
 Joseph Northrup
 William J. Kopas

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who art of all friends the nearest, of all counselors the wisest, of all helpers the ablest and most willing, we rejoice that in Thee our loftiest aspirations and deepest longings find their answer.

Grant that in this moment of sacred communion we may receive a clearer revelation and a richer experience of the eternal truth of God which will set our minds and hearts free from the errors that blind, the doubts that darken, and the fears that weaken us.

We pray that we may yield ourselves to the sovereignty of Thy wise and holy will, not in dumb resignation and sullen submission, but in glad and grateful obedience to the larger life of love and service to which Thou hast called us.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 794. An act for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.; and

S. 2811. An act to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters.

NAZI REBIRTH IN GERMANY MUST BE STOPPED NOW

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what ran through our minds the other day when we read the press re-

ports which indicated that 75 percent of the 11,000 officials in Wuertemberg-Baden once belonged to the Nazi Party. Did they bring to your mind, as they did to mine, the thought that in a few years nazism might again be on the march; that the mammoth ovens would again be sending forth the stench of burning humans, and that concentration camps would again provide living deaths for millions? Where is this promise of democracy that we made? What have we done toward the denazification, demilitarization, and decartelization of Germany?

On January 4, 1950, I introduced House Resolution 413, providing for a full and complete investigation and study of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, with particular reference to the extent to which they have permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis, the resurgence of fascism and antisemitism, and the rebuilding of German military strength. Other Members have since done likewise.

I care not whose resolution is considered, nor am I concerned as to who gets the credit, just so long as the House takes immediate and affirmative action.

In the light of these newspaper and radio stories, which are admitted by our own officials, that nazism is on the march once again in Germany, let us take action now. Not to do so is to betray the many millions who suffered and died in the name of democracy—and those who now believe in the democratic ideal. Let us act before it is too late.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next following the legislative business of the day and any special orders, heretofore entered.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LENA MAE WEST, A MINOR

Mr. LANE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1285) for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor.

BIRMINGHAM VETERANS' HOSPITAL, VAN NUYS, CALIF.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram has come to me from California:

VAN NUYS, CALIF., May 18, 1950.
 Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your support protesting Birmingham Hospital to Long Beach. Paraplegics Grissom and Holmann, also Rose, tubercular veteran, will arrive Washington, TWA flight 220 tomorrow, Friday, 1:45 p. m., to personally appeal to the President. I will join them Saturday. We will stay at Mayflower Hotel. Any assistance you can give

us, particularly with respect securing appointment with the President, will be much appreciated.

STUART BANKHARDT,
Chairman, Citizens Birmingham Hos-
pital Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as the telegram states, three badly disabled veterans are flying in from Van Nuys, Calif., desiring to see the President in an effort to keep the Birmingham Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., open. I have asked him to see them. I believe he must see them.

The hospital is in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], but I have visited the hospital and know many of the patients and the whole situation.

On Tuesday I addressed the following telegram to the President:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16, 1950.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to bring to your attention the proposed closing of the Birmingham Veterans Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif. As you know, this hospital functions in the care of paraplegic and tubercular veterans. Many of these gallant men have built their homes close to this hospital so they could be near to the institution giving them attention and hospitalization. I earnestly protest the closing of this hospital.

In your address Monday night in Chicago you spoke of the great Northwest and its bright future. You spoke of the great future for our wonderful country. You spoke of how much you wanted equal opportunity for everyone in the United States. What is the future for these men striving to regain their health, to recover, to come back, at Birmingham? They are thinking of their future and their opportunities. How can we give them equal opportunity? Can it be done by closing this hospital they need so desperately?

They gave of themselves that we might have victory and the chance to enjoy a free country, where there might be equal opportunity. Before the battle this Government promised everything to these boys who faced the enemy's steel. Now that the battle is over and won, it is convenient to forget. In view of their sacrifice, considered together with the Nation's foreign rehabilitation program, can the closing of the Birmingham Hospital be construed as economy? I know this situation. I know many of the men fighting for their equal opportunity at this hospital. I appeal to you for action to prevent the closing of the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

DEDICATION AND REDEDICATION OF GRAND COULEE DAM

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, all of us have noted with interest the accounts of the President's recent tour of the Northwest, the nonpolitical objective of which was said to be the dedication of a generator or some similar equipment at Grand Coulee Dam. I have also heard reports, which my recollection tells me are correct, that this is the fifth or sixth, or perhaps the ninth, time that Grand Coulee, or some component part of the

structure, has been subjected to dedication by high dignitaries. It seems to me that the secretary, or whoever he is, in charge of dedications is in a rut.

I want it clearly understood that I am not suggesting another stumping tour for Mr. Truman. He managed to travel about twice as far in Montana this time as any other traveler who crosses the State by rail. But if there is occasion for another dedication ceremony, and if a worthy person could be found to do the honors, I think we should consider the fact that Glacier National Park, so far as the records show, has never been dedicated officially for the use and enjoyment of the American people.

Glacier National Park, as you know, is one of the proud attractions of Montana. There is no comparable region in the world, certainly not in our country. It is a park of rugged mountains, high glaciers, beautiful forests such as we have in no other place. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have been thrilled by its grandeur, and we in Montana who know it well always have a yearning to visit it each summer for as long as possible. We are getting along quite well without the folderol of formal dedication, but I think it should be borne in mind when dedications are considered that it really is not necessary to stage these repeat performances at Grand Coulee. We would be glad to welcome you all to a proper ceremony at Montana's Glacier National Park.

DEBT AND THE BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering the last few years just when it became honorable to create debt, when it was the wise and sensible thing to put the people of this country into debt, or even to put yourself into debt so far that you are not going to be able to pay it.

I am appalled when I realize that this Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, or we might term it "the Eighty-worst Congress" is going to be \$7,000,000,000 in the red this year, and when I realize that you expect your children and your children's children, and your great-great-grandchildren to pay the bill that you are not big enough to attempt to pay, I think it is a terrible state of affairs, and I do hope and wish that the Congress and every Member of Congress regardless of whether he be Democrat, Dixiecrat, Republican, or whether he be liberal or conservative, if he calls himself an American, will strive to balance the budget and save creating debt for our children to pay.

FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8199) to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th

Cong.) relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill briefly?

Mr. MORRIS. The bill (H. R. 8199) amends certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 553, 80th Cong.) by extending the period of time allowed the irrigation districts of the Flathead Indian irrigation project to execute new repayment contracts. This merely extends it to a later date.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the bill extends time for the contracts to be completed without any additional work being done.

Mr. MORRIS. I will ask the author of the bill to answer the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No additional funds are involved. This is a renegotiation. The original contracts expire the 24th of this month, hence the need for immediate action.

Mr. RICH. They are not going to do something now by the extension of this act that will permit some new project to come in under this bill that will create additional expense in order to be completed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in the least.

Mr. RICH. In other words, this ends it when the time limit has expired?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Thank goodness we end something very soon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the repayment adjustments and other provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.), providing for the adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes, shall be effective as to lands included in any irrigation district which has or which shall have entered into a contract by May 25, 1951, as provided for in said act. Said act as herein amended shall not be deemed to defer the repayment obligations provided for in existing contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and any irrigation district on the Flathead Indian irrigation project which has not entered into a repayment contract conforming to the provisions of the act of May 25, 1948, as herein amended, unless and until such district shall have entered into such a contract: *Provided,* That the provisions and requirements of section 5 of said act shall be effective when an irrigation district or districts containing not less than 70 percent of the irrigable acreage of the non-Indian lands within the Flathead Indian irrigation project shall have entered into repayment contracts under said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "by May 25, 1951, as provided for in said act" and insert in lieu thereof "conforming to the provisions of said act on or before May 25, 1951."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "provisions and requirements of section 5 of said act shall be effective" and insert in lieu thereof "ap-

appropriation authorizations of said act shall be effective, and moneys appropriated thereunder shall be available for expenditure."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STEED was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE GOVERNMENT DEFICIT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] wanted to rise in the defense of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I think the gentleman needs to defend himself in relation to the speech he made a few minutes ago about the Government deficit, because that deficit is caused by the tax bill which the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress passed and for which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] voted.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I want to say that we gave the people of this country an opportunity to get their taxes reduced. All the gentleman is doing is spending money. He does not want to economize.

THE GOVERNMENT DEFICIT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader of the House has spoken about the tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. I call his attention to the fact that the membership on his side helped to override the President's veto on that tax bill and that it did give relief to some 7,000,000 taxpayers, besides the aged and the blind. The Eightieth Congress balanced the budget, made a big payment on the national debt and cut taxes.

I would ask the majority leader, if he objects so seriously to the tax bill that was passed for the relief of the people of the United States whether he has prepared any bill that would replace the tax on these same people. He and the administration ought to keep faith and get behind legislation to raise taxes—they have a majority of 90 in the House. They should act as they talk if sincere about the tax bill of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I voted against that tax bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But your party helped to override the President's veto—perhaps you lost control of your party.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (a) of Public Law 474, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MURDOCK, of Arizona; Mr. MORRIS, of Oklahoma; and Mr. D'EWARD, of Montana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. KELLY of New York asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a speech by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the President of the United States in Madison, Wis.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Dayton Daily News.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include various charts.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from employees who are protesting against losing their employment.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem and newspaper article.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Weatherford Democrat by Claud Garner.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Mr. GREEN.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech by Dr. Walter Adams.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Dr. C. W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7941) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7941, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through the first section of the bill.

Are there amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate Highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the sum authorized to be apportioned for each year under this subsection, and the sum apportioned to each State may be utilized to pay the Federal pro rata share now authorized by law on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways, or may be used to increase the Federal payment on account of any such project financed with Federal-aid primary or urban funds by one-half of the State's share of the cost thereof over and above the regular Federal pro rata now authorized in such State.

(b) Any State that shall issue bonds and use the proceeds of such bonds for the construction of toll-free facilities in order to accelerate the improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways may apply any portion of the funds herein, or hereafter, authorized for expenditure on said system of highways and apportioned to such State under the provisions of this section

to aid in retirement of annual maturities of the principal indebtedness of such bonds to the extent that the proceeds of such bonds are actually expended in the construction of said system of highways: *Provided*, That payment of Federal funds on the principal indebtedness of such bonds shall be made only on account of any such facility that is constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved in advance of construction by the Commissioner of Public Roads: *Provided further*, That payment of Federal funds pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed the pro rata basis authorized by subsection (a) of this section: *And provided further*, That payments to any State pursuant to this subsection shall be made exclusively from apportionments to such State from funds authorized by the Congress to be apportioned for expenditure on said system of highways and this subsection shall not be construed as a commitment or obligation on the part of the United States to provide such funds.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 3, line 6, strike out all of section 2 starting in line 6, page 3, and running down to r-1 including line 2 on page 5.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment the Clerk has just read strikes out section 2, which refers to the allocation of \$70,000,000 for an interstate highway system under a new formula that is established in this enabling legislation. This formula is 75 percent Federal participation and 25 percent State.

Under the law that has been in existence for a number of years, we have a 50-50 matching basis. In other words, the Federal Government puts up 50 cents and the various States put up 50 cents. This covers all groups of roads. Under the bill before us for consideration now, section 2 sets aside \$70,000,000 for what is known as an interstate system, and in the allocation we have the Federal Government putting up 75 cents and the States 25 cents.

I think you will agree with me that every State is better fixed financially than our Federal Government, so why should we ask the Federal Government to put up 75 cents for a special road program and the States only 25 cents for this program? If that formula is good for the interstate highway system, why is not that formula good for the other highway systems as, for instance, the farm-to-market roads, the primary roads, and other systems?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Ohio is not proposing, is he, that we change the formula with respect to other roads such as the farm-to-market roads, rural roads, and urban roads?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am opposed to any changing of the existing formula, because the existing formula calls for a 50-50 matching clause. I do not think we should give preferential treatment, either, to one particular type of road. I might call to the gentleman's attention that the so-called interstate system represents only 20 percent of the road construction in the United States.

So why should we set aside \$70,000,000 in addition to the regular funds which will be allocated to them under the other formula if this special road system only represents 20 percent of the road mileage in the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sure the gentleman recalls that the hearings disclosed approximately 30 percent of the total amount of the roads program in 1949 was for the interstate system. If this interstate system is going to serve the functions for which it was designed, then it is a Federal responsibility and it will eliminate a tremendous amount of the matching on the part of the States. Therefore, since it is primarily a function of the Federal Government, that is the reason the formula was written as it was.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I recognize the argument that the gentleman makes. That argument has been proposed for a number of years by a group of individuals who want the Federal Government to pay more than the States. But why is this interstate system any more important than any other system? Your interstate system is going to carry individuals on a pleasure trip and perhaps may be a truck route, but why is it more necessary than the farm-to-market road which will bring the produce from the farm to the market? Why is it more necessary than the State system of roads. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing back of this whole program and that is a drive to break down the 50-50 formula for matching funds in our highway program and to start a definite program to change the matching formula from the now existing law of 50-50 to 75 percent to 25 percent.

I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to establish a formula of 75-25 for the interstate system of highways, then why should it not be established for the other systems. I want to state unequivocally that I am opposed to the 75-25 formula whether it be for the interstate system of roads, or for the farm-to-market system of roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This \$70,000,000 which is set up here is merely foot-in-the-door legislation, is it not?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is absolutely correct. The record will show that this \$70,000,000 is simply a drop in the bucket of the amount of money needed for the completing of the interstate highway system.

But, Mr. Chairman, as soon as we break down the existing formula, next year you are going to be asked to change the formula for all the road systems and then the Federal Government is going to

have to put up 75 percent of a \$500,000,000 authorization, and the States that are wealthier and in a sounder financial condition than the Federal Government will only be putting up 25 percent.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the formula under which this money is to be distributed is more favorable to the more populous States and less favorable to the thinly populated States?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. D'EWARD. I believe that is another reason why this particular section should be revised.

I consider this a fair and equitable bill in all except section 2. It extends for two more years the present road program and adds in section 2 \$70,000,000 to be divided on a population basis. This \$70,000,000 for each of the fiscal years is for construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways and is justified in part by national defense. I have no objection to this item or its purpose.

However, the sum is "apportioned among the States in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, but that no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the sum apportioned for each fiscal year."

The point I wish to make is that this formula is unfair to the sparsely settled States such as Montana. It should be apportioned on the basis of the mileage in each State. I fear under this formula my State, Montana, will get little money in proportion to the large number of miles of this class of road found in my State.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to call to your attention the fact that the various organizations which appeared before our committee were in opposition to this 75-25 formula. The various farm organizations are definitely opposed to the 75-25 formula.

I also refer you to the testimony of Mr. Miller on page 377. He represented the American Association of State Highways. I quote:

We felt then, and we feel now, that it surrenders a sound and definite procedure for a questionable and indefinite result.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Montana raised the point that the more populous States would receive a greater ratio of the participation by the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, in the State of Nevada you would have 91.34 percent Federal participation in this construction program. So, you would actually have more in such States as Montana and Nevada.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The chart is in the hearings and it will show just how much each State will gain by it and how much additional it will cost the Federal Government. But, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate this will be breaking down and start-

ing a new policy and we will never know how much it is going to cost the Federal Government. If the State is of the opinion that the road is not worth half what it costs the State, then that road should not be constructed. Mr. Chairman, let us not start in on this new formula of 75 percent of Federal aid and 25 percent of State contribution. I hope my amendment will be accepted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if no other Member desires to be recognized on this amendment, I ask for recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the pending section close in 8 minutes, the same time that was allowed the gentleman from Ohio, and that I be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as stated in the report of the committee, this section authorizing appropriations to be apportioned among all of the States occurs for the first time in the pending bill, and the amount is \$70,000,000. Its purpose is to encourage the construction or reconstruction of the so-called interregional system of highways. The Members will recall that that system contains about 40,000 miles of parts of the primary and urban roads of the United States, and that those roads are the roads that are traveled by all of the people of the country. They connect the principal cities of one State with another. They are the most important roads in the United States. They are the roads that were selected by the Department of National Defense as being essential to national defense. Those roads have to be straightened in a great many places. They have to be widened in other places. Safety has to be promoted.

We are not undertaking to change the formula for Federal aid. That formula obtains in the \$500,000,000 authorized for Federal primary aid, secondary aid, and urban aid in the previous section of this bill; but, in an effort to promote the construction of the interregional system, the States are to be encouraged to ask that those parts of those roads that should be widened, that should be straightened, be submitted in applications first, and in order to encourage their construction we propose here to authorize \$70,000,000 to be apportioned among the States to increase the Federal share only on those roads that are on that system.

It should be kept in mind that in World War II the highways of the West, from Denver to Seattle, to San Francisco, and other western cities, were used more than any other highways of the country, because there are fewer miles of railroads, comparatively, and it was necessary for the highways to be used to transport the essentials for the prosecution of the war. Inasmuch as the principle of matching is to continue under the terms of this bill, and in order to encourage the States to apply for the construction of these interregional highways, we in this particular provi-

sion provide for an increase of the Federal-aid share. It is for the benefit of the Western States as well as other States. Take the State of Wyoming, or the State of Montana, where they do not put up 50 percent, but less than 50 percent to match, those States will get the benefit of this provision, and they are entitled to it in order to provide, without matching 50-50, for the construction and for the straightening and for the improvement of this interregional system.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield in just a minute.

This is the national defense system. These are the roads that are used by the people of the country everywhere. They obtain in all of the States of the Union. We do not change the formula for Federal aid, but, in order to enable the States to apply for the construction of the needed improvements on this interregional system we do provide this money so as to supplement the 50 percent that they contribute where there is 50 percent obtaining.

The committee considered this provision very carefully. This bill comes before you with the unanimous report of the committee. The State highway department, the Commissioner of Public Roads asked us to include not \$70,000,000 but \$210,000,000 for this purpose, because, I remind you, that in the Defense Highway Act of 1941 the Congress of the United States on the strategic highways for national defense, under the terms of that act, paid 75 percent of the construction of those highways, substantially synonymous with the interregional highways. The Government paid under the act of 1941 three-quarters of the cost of the roads. We must be constructive. We must provide for needs as they arise. We have a report from the Commissioner of Public Roads—House Document 249, Eighty-first Congress—recommending among other things that it is imperative for the public benefit that our interregional or interstate or national defense system of highways be improved, that they be widened and that such improvement is essential in national defense.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he desired to clarify his statement that this was for the completion of the interregional system.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I thank the gentlemen. I intended to say, and I think I did say, that it was to encourage construction and to promote improvement of parts of the interregional system. Only about \$1,000,000 of Federal-aid funds have been used on the interregional system and only about 5,000 miles have been completed in the past 5 years. It is important that the improvement be stepped up for if the present rate of improvement and construction continues it would take at least 40 years to improve the system. We may have another war before 40 years.

Mr. STEFAN. Then \$140,000,000 in 2 years will not complete the system.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it will take 40 to 90 years to complete that system and rebuild it according to the testimony before our committee, unless there are increased provisions made for the construction of the interregional system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And changing the formula as proposed in the amendment will not decrease the amount to be furnished by the Federal Government, will it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It certainly will not, and it will not interfere with the formula that now exists that is provided for in this bill for matching Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban roads. It will increase only the Federal contribution as provided in the section when the States apply for the construction or reconstruction or rebuilding of those parts of the primary and urban roads that are in the interregional system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But there is nothing in the bill to prevent any State from going ahead as fast as it wants to in road building, is there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely not. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That would be in addition to the amount to be furnished by the Federal Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing to prevent that at all.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave a false impression; does the chairman intend to leave the impression that it does not make any difference in the amount furnished by the Federal Government whether it is furnished on the 50-50 basis or on the 75-25 basis?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want it to be absolutely clear; none of these roads pass through my district. This does increase the Federal contribution for roads in the interregional system that are applied for by the States. The initiative lies with the States. But I want to make it equally clear that the increase of the Federal share will not be more than 25 percent and that it is applicable only to the \$70,000,000 and only to the interregional system. There is no change whatever in the principle of matching Federal-aid funds under the \$500,000,000 authorized.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Then, the gentleman from Iowa was in error.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think not. The gentleman from Iowa stated that changing the formula under the \$70,000,000 would not decrease the amount to be furnished by the Federal Government. I agreed with him. It is the most constructive provision in this bill, carried for the first time. If we want to provide for the needs of the Nation we must go forward; we cannot stand still. For my part, in the improvement of the highways of the country I propose to go forward at least to the extent of making this rather modest authorization for the interregional system of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired; all time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CROSS) there were—ayes 20, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. MCGREGOR.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 17, noes 70.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count on the point of order that a quorum is not present. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, immediately upon the passage of this act, the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, according to the area and value of the land owned by the Government within the national forests therein which the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to determine and certify to him from such information, sources, and departments as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem most accurate, and hereafter, on or before January 1 next preceding the commencement of each succeeding fiscal year the Secretary of Commerce shall make like apportionment of the appropriation authorized for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Public Roads may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to the Commissioner of Public Roads for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Works Committee I should like to

say that in the hearings before the committee one could not help but be impressed from the volume of testimony given by directors of various State highway departments and by the Commissioner of Public Roads here in Washington, with the fact that due to the war and increased traffic, more roads over the past few years have been worn out than there has been new miles built. I think we have about 3,000 miles less roads in first-class condition today than we had in the beginning of the war.

Sufficient transportation for the distribution of goods will speed up and increase the economy, or income of the Nation. The lack of good roads conversely will slow down the production and thereby the volume of business in the Nation.

This brings us to the consideration of the bill before us which is an extension and continuation of the splendid national road policy laid down in the act of 1944. The bill seeks to provide for the appropriation of funds to continue to carry out this policy of the matching of funds on a Federal and State basis for the year 1952 and 1953. The bill provides for this particular purpose without some expansions provided in the bill, for the appropriation of \$500,000,000 for each of the years referred to, of which \$225,000,000 has been allocated for projects on the Federal aid primary system.

One hundred and fifty million dollars for projects on the Federal aid secondary highway system.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars for projects on Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

The question may be raised that this is a considerable amount of money in view of our present fiscal condition. When one takes into consideration that the cost of road building has doubled within the last number of years, one can readily see that the amount is not large when applied to the number of miles of roads at present prices that can be built.

We are faced with the necessity, I think, of providing the above amounts designated. It is probably one of the best and most profitable investments that the Federal Government can make in cooperation with the States. Our highways, which have become run-down because of the war, and a continuing greater amount of traffic, must be extended and repaired in the interest of the growing economy of the Nation.

When you take into consideration that we are spending billions of dollars to rehabilitate various European countries, and that we are spending over \$500,000,000 a year in the building of roads, transportation facilities, and flood-control projects in Europe, how can one say that we can be justified in not doing this much for the people of America in the way of improving our highway system, and in bringing farm-to-market roads to the rural areas for the convenience of our own people, and to stimulate the productivity and distribution capacity of our own people who are taxed to pay the billions that are being expended in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, this money invested in roads, if we do not invest it, in my judg-

ment, will cause a loss to the people of our Nation in the wear and tear of motor vehicles over our roads and in the loss of time which would possibly amount to a total of the \$500,000,000 provided for in this bill.

You remember the slowdown of motor traffic, the wear and tear and tremendous expense on motor vehicles in the early days of motor transportation before we had this better highway system. I repeat—this is an investment that cannot be denied the people of our Nation.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

I well recall the debates when we embarked on this greater expansion of road building laid down in the act of 1944. Some of us then insisted, and were successful in securing a greater allotment for the Federal-aid secondary-highway system, including farm-to-market roads. I should like to point out that \$150,000,000, or 30 percent of the total amount in this bill is continued for such purpose. I should like to further point out that over 50 percent of the rural roads so necessary to our people have not yet been improved under this particular provision of the bill.

In my district in southern Illinois, while we have made considerable progress along this line, yet it is my belief that far over 50 percent of the county and township roads have not been able to participate under this particular section of the bill.

And at this time, I would like to call your attention to the fact that it seems that the State directors of the public-roads divisions of the various States have not given the sufficient attention and cooperation to the county and township officials in pushing forward the improvement of county and township farm-to-market roads that the Congress intended they should do when the act was passed in 1944.

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, this question was raised when the act was extended in the Eightieth Congress, which wisely, in my judgment, tried to call the attention of this lack of cooperation to the Commissioner of Public Roads here in Washington, and particularly to the various State directors whose duty it was to extend full cooperation to county and township road officials.

At that time there was written into the act the following amendment:

In selecting county and township roads on which funds are to be extended, State highway departments shall cooperate with the township trustees and other appropriate local road officials.

I hope in the future that better cooperation will be extended to the end that the farmers of my district and the Nation will speedily obtain better roads so necessary over which to move their products from the farm to the local markets, and the markets of the Nation. Better roads will cause much greater investment in the building of more productive farm land, better homes and buildings on the farms, greater production, greater comforts and conveniences in farm living, which will help to keep the young men and women on the farms where they can make a greater contribution to their community, State, and Nation.

To my mind, this is one of the best sections of the bill and will probably make the greatest contribution to the public welfare of any section of the bill. As a member of the committee, after hearing all of the testimony presented, I am confident that the bill should be passed in the interest of the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman actually believe we are rehabilitating the rest of the world with the billions of dollars we are spending abroad, or are we just giving away some money?

Mr. VURSELL. At any rate, we are spending the money, too much I think, but a lot of it is going for that purpose.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out that this is not a gift but is a wise investment and will pay great dividends not only in the economic sense but in that it will save many lives. As the gentleman well knows, transportation wins or loses wars as well as determines our domestic economy.

Mr. VURSELL. I find myself in full agreement with the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for \$1,273,000,000. It is \$70,000,000 more a year than was provided 2 years ago. That means it is \$140,000,000 more. I know in my territory they are building roads with this money, which roads do not need to be built. I know they are getting into extravagances that they do not need to indulge in. The trouble with this whole set-up is that the over-all statute provides they can enter into contracts for the expenditure of this money without any appropriation and without any immediate survey being made of the needs that might arise. That is one reason why they are indulging in these extravagances. Frankly, I cannot vote for this bill. It goes way beyond what we ought to try to do, especially being in the situation that we are in. The Treasury is dead broke and we have obligations to meet in connection with our national defense. I think it is very dangerous for us to go ahead and think of nothing but improving the deficiencies and enlarging the deficit. Frankly, I am perhaps an exception to the general rule. I believe in economy, not only in our appropriations for foreign aid, but I also believe in economy in our domestic affairs. I even went so far as to believe in economy on that foolish performance of the sesquicentennial celebration.

I hope we will recover back what money is left as a result of that foolish performance.

I just wish that this could be put up on a business basis, so that they would be required to justify what they intend to do each time, before they start in obligating the Government of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. In section 2, which we tried to strike out a little while ago, we heard a great deal of talk about the need for building defense highways in the country. Is it specified under section 2 that this money is to be spent for defense highways?

Mr. TABER. Not as far as I can read it. I cannot find it in there.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That which is called interregional is also called the defense highway system, as is shown by the reports that I have before me and that have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to see one bill come into this House for the spending of money in which they did not allude to the dire necessity for defense. Ninety-nine percent of the bills coming in here are passed because they are necessary for the defense of this country. I believe in the defense of this country but I do not like to see every bill brought in here predicated upon that argument.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. Frankly, I cannot vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have high regard for the views of my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER]. This bill does provide for \$1,270,000,000 substantially over a period of 2 years. It provides for \$636,000,000 annually, assuming that all of the appropriations are made. It is substantially the same authorization that has been passed every 2 years, except for the amounts, since 1921. If there is one State that is spending more money, both Federal aid and local, than another in the United States it is the State of New York. They are constructing, at a cost of many millions of dollars, a thoroughway there. They are undertaking to meet the increasing needs for highways in the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] complains of the contract features of this bill. Those features are applicable only to the Federal-aid, primary, secondary, and urban roads. They are not applicable to the forests or to the park and other authorizations in this bill. They have been contained in every bill that has been passed since the Highway Act of 1921 as amended in 1925. They protect the Federal Treasury, for, instead of appropriating the full amount of the authorizations, these contract provisions enable the legisla-

ture to match those funds. Forty-four of the legislatures meet in 1951. Ordinarily, after they have been apportioned, it takes from 12 to 24 months to prepare the plans. The gentleman came before the committee in the Eightieth Congress with respect to this contract feature, in connection with my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and made the same proposal, and it was there shown, and I emphasize now the fact, that it may be 2 years before the appropriations that have already been authorized will actually be made. It is a question of whether or not you want to appropriate the funds, let them lie idle in the Treasury, or make the appropriations as the works are completed.

So I assert that it is in the public interest to provide for this contract feature, as we have done for 25 years. It has been done. It has been tried. It has been tested. It has been in force ever since the Budget and Accounting Act was passed during the Harding administration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. Furthermore, under the terms of this bill it does provide for an increase of \$70,000,000. We retained the fundamental principle of matching on Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban roads. That seventy million applies to the interregional system. That is synonymous with the national defense system. If we are to provide for national defense in Europe and in Asia, and with our experience in World War II, certainly we can do no less than to provide for the transportation that is absolutely essential to production, in the event of world war III.

In this connection I say in conclusion that the people of the United States are paying in Federal use taxes every year for these roads. In 1949 they paid \$1,326,054,091. Those who pay these taxes are entitled to the roads, and we can do no less than to provide for substantially the amount that is being paid in the form of Federal gasoline taxes of 1½ percent. The provisions of this bill for \$500,000,000 were contained in the bill when the Eightieth Congress considered it when it passed the House. It went to the other body and after several days of conferences the other body's representatives in control at that time insisted upon a reduction. It may be of interest to note that the two Senators who insisted upon it were defeated in the very next election.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired, all time has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the expiration of time I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended 2 minutes in order that I may yield to the gentleman from New York for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My objection has been to that contract feature, that there is no detailed review ahead of the starting in of that contract proposition, and there needs to be because of extravagances about which I know in the construction of highways way beyond the requirements of the territory.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman stated that in his remarks a few minutes ago.

Mr. TABER. That is why I objected to it, because there was no detailed review. That is why we are presented with a mess instead of a real forward-looking program that will benefit the country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a kind of economy that is constructive; there is such a thing as economy that is destructive. I repeat that if the gentleman's contention were to prevail, member as he is of the Committee on Appropriations, honoring him as I do, that the Federal Government would have been required during this fiscal year to have made twice the appropriations that we are making for Federal-aid roads. By this provision the money remains in the Federal Treasury until the contracts have been completed or payments for work done are required. The testimony shows that all of the States need the amounts that will be apportioned to them for the next two fiscal years, and in fact it shows that much more will be needed than is authorized. It will take some ten billion alone to strengthen, widen, and reconstruct the interregional system. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report estimates today that the deficiencies of roads, streets, and highways in the United States amounts to over \$41,000,000,000. The contract provisions in the pending bill and in all previous highway acts are most important. The roads are selected by the State highway departments and in the case of secondary roads by the county or township supervisors, and they are approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads. The contract provision is absolutely essential to the sound working of the Federal-aid program. If the contention of my friend, the gentleman from New York, prevailed, the Committee on Appropriations would select the roads or parts of roads to be constructed in every State. I prefer the provisions of the pending bill and of all previous Federal-aid legislation under which the State highway departments select the roads and build them after they have been approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads. The public interest will be promoted by passing the pending bill to match the \$500,000,000 authorized for primary, secondary, and urban roads, and for \$70,000,000 with which to increase the Federal share on the interregional highway system for the general convenience and to promote national defense. By all means the contract provision should obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired; all time on this section has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That of the sum authorized by this subsection for each fiscal year not more than \$4,000,000 shall be used for the maintenance of such roads and trails and not more than \$1,000,000 shall be used for the construction of minor roads and trails: *Provided further*, That hereafter appropriations for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such park and monument roads shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, and projects for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of such park and monument roads shall be agreed upon jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That of the sum authorized by this subsection for each fiscal year not more than \$500,000 shall be used for the maintenance of parkway roads and not more than \$400,000 shall be used for the construction of minor roads and trails within parkway boundaries: *Provided further*, That hereafter appropriations for the construction of parkways shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, and projects for parkway construction shall be agreed upon jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Bureau of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads.

SEC. 5. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), and the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 6. That section 14 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. It shall be the duty of the State to maintain any highway within its boundaries after construction under the provisions of this act. If at any time the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads shall find

that any such highway in any State is not being properly maintained he shall call such fact to the attention of the highway department of such State and if within 90 days after receipt of such notice said highway has not been put in a proper condition of maintenance, then the Commissioner of Public Roads shall withhold approval of further projects in such State until such highway has been restored to a proper condition of maintenance: *Provided*, That in any State wherein the highway department is without legal authority to maintain a highway so constructed as a secondary or an urban road project the highway department of such State shall enter into a formal agreement with the appropriate officials of the county or city in which such highway is located for its maintenance, and if at any time the Commissioner of Public Roads shall find that such highway is not being properly maintained he shall call such fact to the attention of the highway department of such State and if within 90 days after receipt of such notice said highway has not been put in proper condition of maintenance then the Commissioner of Public Roads shall withhold approval of further secondary or urban road projects in such county or city until said highway shall have been placed in a proper condition of maintenance."

SEC. 7. That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), is hereby amended by increasing the Federal share payable on account of the costs of rights-of-way from "one-third" to not exceed "one-half" of such costs.

SEC. 8. Section 3a of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended by the act of February 20, 1931 (46 Stat. 1173), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3a. That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to cooperate with the State highway departments and with the Department of the Interior in the construction of public highways within Indian reservations and national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and to pay the amount assumed therefor from the funds allotted or apportioned under this act to the State wherein the reservations and national parks and monuments are located."

SEC. 9. Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, as an emergency relief fund, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the primary or secondary Federal-aid highway systems which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended from time to time under the authority of this section: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Commissioner of Public Roads: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

SEC. 10. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carry-

ing out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$75,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

Sec. 11. The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the Commissioner of Public Roads any authority vested in him by this act.

Sec. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 13. That all acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

Sec. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950."

Mr. WHITTINGTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, after conferring with the ranking minority member and other members of the committee, and in order to facilitate the orderly consideration of the bill, inasmuch as we have passed the main provisions of the bill and the main authorizations, the others being for national parks, national monuments, and forest roads, and some clarifying amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open to amendment; that the Chairman call the numbered sections consecutively for amendment until the last section has been disposed of. This will not prevent the offering of amendments but will facilitate the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 4?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'KONSKI: On page 8, line 13, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will increase the authorization for roads on Indian reservations and Indian lands from the sum of \$6,000,000 to a total of \$8,000,000.

When you consider that the roads on Indian reservations and Indian lands of the United States comprise some 20,000 miles of road, and you are allowing the magnificent sum of \$6,000,000 to take care of these 20,000 miles of road on Indian reservations and Indian lands, perhaps it would be just as well if we did not appropriate anything at all for maintenance of those roads. Dividing 20,000 miles into the sum of \$6,000,000, you get the measly sum of \$300 per mile of road. How much of a road can you maintain for \$300 per mile?

The difficulty in dealing with Indian roads and Indian lands is the difficulty that we have experienced in Congress all the way through. We show an abject amount of neglect of the Indian problem

until an expose occurs, something like happened a year ago in reference to condition of the Navajo Indians. Then we hurry up and appropriate haphazardly eighty or ninety million dollars to take care of the problem that should have been taken care of as the years went by.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs asked for the sum of \$13,900,000 to do the job that it thought ought to be done. The amendment I propose does not give the entire amount asked by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It merely raises the amount from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000. I am sure that the members of the committee when they realize 20,000 miles of road have to be taken care of, and when they realize the importance of taking care of those roads and doing something to help solve the Indian problem throughout the United States of America, will reconsider and raise this small amount from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 so that a better job can be done.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The bill that was originally introduced and considered by the committee before the committee rewrote the bill and before this bill we have before us was introduced only provided \$4,000,000. On account of the floods that have occurred in North Dakota, through the request of a number of our colleagues who are interested in Indian lands, the committee increased the amount to \$6,000,000, which is the largest authorization ever carried in any bill.

May I say in this connection that I have before me the amounts of authorizations that have been made up to and including the present fiscal year for Indian lands under the acts of 1944 and 1948, and I find that there are authorized \$17,649,000 that have not been appropriated. In view of the unappropriated funds heretofore authorized, notwithstanding our sympathy for the Indians, and they are in distress because of the floods in several of the States, the committee feels this is a most generous authorization in the pending bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I appreciate the contribution made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi and I respect his judgment a great deal; however, I think that this authorization should be increased from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000. The committee was gracious enough, as the chairman pointed out, to raise the sum, after we appeared before the committee, from four to six million dollars, which is very much appreciated.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this is the amount carried in the bill in 1948. When you consider the \$17,000,000 on hand, plus the \$12,000,000 which this bill will carry in 2 years, there will be nearly \$30,000,000 to be expended on Indian reservation roads. It does seem to me that is ample and adequate to take care of the problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And as my colleague will recall the act of 1944 carried \$6,000,000 for this purpose, as did the act of 1948.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I realize and appreciate the position of the leaders of the Public Works Committee. I know that our job lies not so much with the members of this distinguished committee as with the members of the Appropriations Committee to try to get the adequate amounts to do the right kind of job by the Indian Bureau in the field of roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. Chairman, the committee raised the amount in question 50 percent before reporting this bill to the floor. With the amounts remaining unobligated and on hand, it seems to me we are providing generously for Indian roads. No harm will be done the program by sustaining the amount specified in the bill. I therefore think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] should not be approved, and I ask that it be rejected.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin on the basis of the destruction that has occurred by reason of the terrific floods in North Dakota and Minnesota. Considerable of that destruction has been in the territory of Indian reservations. I want the Members to take cognizance of the fact that millions of dollars worth of roads and bridges have been destroyed in the State of Minnesota, in the State of North Dakota, and down through South Dakota. I think it is very worthy that some consideration be given in the provision of this extra \$2,000,000. I know the \$2,000,000 the gentleman attempts to add as an amendment is limited to Indian reservations, but that will help both Minnesota and North Dakota in the rehabilitation of utterly destroyed highways and roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 4?

Are there any amendments to section 5? Section 6? Section 7? Section 8? Section 9?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLMES: On page 10, line 23, after "Sec. 9," insert "(a)" and on page 11, after line 22, insert the following:

"(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to provide for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of roads (including defense service roads, bridges, tubes, and tunnels) in order to provide access and service to military, naval, and air force reservations, facilities, and installations, and to defense industries and defense facilities and installations; and in order to correct critical deficiencies in existing roads in adjacent communities on which

there is serious congestion due primarily to traffic generated by military, naval, and air force reservations, facilities, and installations, or by defense industries and defense facilities and installations, when such roads are certified to the Secretary of Commerce as essential to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Chairman of the Munitions Board of the Department of Defense, or by the Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense. Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the provisions of such act in carrying out the provisions of this section and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended from time to time under authority of this section: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such road pursuant to this section shall not exceed the Federal pro rata share of the cost of projects authorized by the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, in the State in which such construction, reconstruction, or improvement work is undertaken."

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to section 9, starting at the bottom of page 10, does not change the total authorization of the bill one dollar. It does set aside a \$10,000,000 fund to be administered by the Public Roads Administration in exactly the same manner as the Committee on Public Works has set aside certain sums of money in the past and in this bill for administering emergency funds.

There are areas within the United States, which might be termed "defense areas," where, I believe, the authority contained in this amendment is required for two reasons: First, to permit prompt and rapid evacuation should any emergency or defense purpose make necessary such evacuation; second, to meet present-day emergency conditions arising from the establishment of military installations or defense plants in an area where the present highway system is inadequate. These two reasons involve both security and efficient operations at these installations.

This amendment will give to the proper Federal agencies necessary authority to cooperate with State agencies. It will permit the allocation of funds out of the total authorized appropriations for the Federal Aid Road Act, and thus not require any additional money authorization to that proposed in H. R. 7941.

The administration of the authorization is properly safeguarded through the requirement for certification by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and so forth. It conforms with the policy followed by Congress in providing emergency funds to meet extraordinary conditions. It follows also the pattern of the Public Roads Administration in its program, and the language is in a form to meet and conform with Public Roads Administration procedure.

The suggestion has been made that there already is legislation on the subject covered by the bill. This, however,

is not the case. Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941—Fifty-fifth Statutes, page 765—provided for the construction of roads to military and naval reservations and to defense industries and defense-industry sites during the period of the emergency when certified as being important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. Section 6 of said act authorized appropriations for paying the entire cost of the construction of such roads when so certified. However, the act approved July 25, 1947—Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress—contained the following provisions:

That the following statutory provisions are hereby repealed: * * *. The provisions of the act of November 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, relating to the availability for obligation of funds appropriated pursuant to said act, as amended, except that such funds shall remain available for the completion of access-road projects which are now under construction.

The effect of the above clause is to terminate the availability of funds under section 6 of the Defense Highway Act except as to such funds as were permitted to remain available for the completion of access-road projects then under construction. There is not, therefore, any law now in effect which authorizes the construction of such access roads and provides funds for that purpose.

The purpose of this amendment is to make provision for meeting situations such as outlined above, when certified as necessary in connection with the national defense. It follows the pattern of legislation which has been enacted by Congress over a long period of years with respect to relief in emergencies. In other words, it provides a stand-by authority which can be invoked in conformity with the provisions of the amendment, and would make it unnecessary for Congress to provide more specific legislative authority and funds for the purpose in individual instances that may arise.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention particularly by conditions existing in the Columbia Basin west of the Columbia River resulting from the establishment of the Hanford Engineer Works of the Atomic Energy Commission there. This plant was, of necessity, located in a sparsely settled area. It has resulted in a tremendous increase in population, which has created many complex problems in community life, not only for the Government city of Richland, but also for the two neighboring cities of Kennewick and Pasco, both of which have doubled and tripled in population. The problem is again multiplied by the recent announcement that troops will be garrisoned in the Hanford area beginning April 1. The construction program to furnish quarters for these troops will begin soon after July 1, it is expected, and this will add an additional burden because of the workmen coming into the area on this new construction.

One of the chief problems has been an increasingly difficult traffic situation directly attributable to the lack of suf-

ficient bridge facilities across the Columbia River. This, in turn, has pointed up the national-defense problem as to what could be done in the event any evacuation of that area might become necessary. Should any emergency arise, through any cause whatever, calling for rapid evacuation of the area to the west of the Columbia River, there is, at present, no way by which either the Government force or civilian personnel could be moved across the Columbia River and to the east or southeast because of the lack of facilities to cross this great river. There is, at present, only an inadequate narrow two-lane, State-owned bridge, built in 1922, to permit crossing of the river and to handle traffic. This traffic, verified by a State highway department count in 1948, totaled 104,000 vehicles in a week, and a later count totaled 18,000 vehicles in 24 hours. In any emergency there would be at least 75,000 to 100,000 people to evacuate, an impossible task as conditions now exist, should it be necessary to do so quickly.

There is no highway bridge to the north on the Columbia River from Kennewick except the Vantage Ferry bridge on route 10, a distance of some 75 miles. To the south on the Columbia River, there is no highway bridge until you reach the White Salmon-Hood River bridge, which is just 65 miles out of Portland, Oreg., and a journey of about 150 to 160 miles from the Kennewick-Pasco bridge. It would be impossible to get to the Vantage Ferry bridge because it would require going straight through the Hanford Reservation or through a very circuitous route farther west.

The State highway department, realizing the emergency, has made a thorough study of the necessity for a new bridge at that location. In predicting the traffic for the future in this area, it is indicated that by 1951, if a bridge could be completed by that time, there would be on the existing bridge an annual average daily count of 8,707, and on a new structure, a count of 11,190.

The existing bridge between Pasco and Kennewick is only 19 feet between curbs. Of the average of 16,234 vehicles using the bridge daily, the State highway department advises me that an origin-destination survey shows an average daily traffic count of 9,150 vehicles using the present bridge, which was entirely generated by reason of the installation at Richland. I am advised by the State highway department that application was made some time ago through the Public Roads Administration, supported by a resolution from the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, for an allocation of Federal money as a matching fund to enable the State highway department to construct a bridge across the Columbia River between Pasco and Kennewick capable of handling the increased traffic at that point. As explained before, funds could not be allocated until legislation of this nature could be passed.

I urge favorable consideration by the House of this proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. As I understand it, in the event that the appropriate military officials certify the need for a road, then the Public Roads Commission has the right to allocate the funds for that road?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; under the limitation of a fund of money which I have asked to be set aside, in the amendment, of \$10,000,000 will be used in extraordinary circumstances by the certification of the Public Roads Commission and the Department of Defense in exactly the same manner as they handle extraordinary situations with flood moneys.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know of two installations in southern California out in the Mojave Desert, which are very much isolated from the rest of the world. Would that kind of installation be eligible in the event a proper certification is made and if they could convince the Roads Commission? Then could they get some highway relief?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; they would.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it does not increase the amount authorized by this bill?

Mr. HOLMES. No; it does not increase the amount by a single dollar.

Mr. JOHNSON. It only carves out a maximum of \$10,000,000 from the full amount of the authorization. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLMES. That is correct, plus the fact, may I say to the gentleman from California, that this amendment operates in the same manner as a 50-50 matching fund with the various areas that are involved that is with certified projects. While during the war emergency the Government paid the entire bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. In other words, if that were done in my State, California would match the amount on the basis of 50 percent?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. And that would be the situation in every other State?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What does the gentleman's amendment provide as to where this money would come from?

Mr. HOLMES. It would come out of the authorization in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. So that, if the gentleman's amendment prevails, the amount to be set aside would lower the other authorizations in the bill which are intended for other purposes?

Mr. HOLMES. It would only be involved in handling that particular type of emergency and extraordinary conditions, as you do in flood-control work.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this the same amendment that the gentleman proposed before the committee?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is being very frank, but that is not the whole story. There is a little word, to wit: "revolving." As I recall the amendment and as I recall the gentleman's bill, it might involve \$10,000,000 or it might involve \$20,000,000 or it might involve a great deal more. It is indefinite on the face of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. In reply to the distinguished chairman, the amendment is limited to the \$10,000,000 fund. That is a limitation placed in the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With all due deference, that means a revolving fund, and it is to begin with \$10,000,000, but it may aggregate \$100,000,000 before we get through.

Mr. HOLMES. It does not have to be replenished past the \$10,000,000 point until it is used up under the language of the amendment and only after proper certification of a project by the Public Roads Administration and the Department of Defense.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, certainly not.

Mr. HOLMES. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, translated, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] means that for the enlargement and building of a bridge across the Columbia River, Washington and Oregon be given preference in the matter of bridge construction in the United States.

The gentleman has a bill that has been considered by our committee. We heard him. The hearings are available to the membership. The committee declined to embrace the provisions of the gentleman's bill and the gentleman's amendment. The committee rejected it, and I think properly so.

Section 9 treats all of the States exactly alike with respect to emergencies. Section 9 is not new law. It obtained in 1934, 1936, and 1943. It provides that in emergencies, in the event of a storm or a catastrophe of any kind, \$10,000,000 only—not a revolving fund—\$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated as authorized

in this bill shall be made immediately available so that if a Federal-aid road or bridge has been destroyed or damaged it would not be necessary to wait until the next session of the Congress to repair it.

The provisions of that section have been tried and approved. That fund has been exhausted. So we ask in this bill, under section 9, that that law be reenacted, because that fund has been exhausted. But the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], with respect to an atomic project out there, has got a congested condition. There is a bridge across the Columbia River and congestion obtains when you reach the approaches. That is true whether it is down here at the Fourteenth Street bridge over the Potomac River in Washington, or whether it is a bridge over many other rivers and in many cities and States. That condition obtains generally in the United States. The committee pointed out that in many cities in this country there are rivers that divide cities, and it is just as necessary that additional bridges be constructed in those cities as it is near an atomic energy project, in the gentleman's district.

Out of the billions that we have authorized for that atomic energy project, a railroad has been constructed to reach it. Under national defense, if they need help, as I understand the law, the Atomic Commission has a right to provide funds for the construction of a highway or a bridge. But now, in addition to the funds allocated to his State, the gentleman, vigilant and persistent, I might add, and properly so, in behalf of his constituents, asks the Congress to provide a revolving fund to construct a bridge out there that he is interested in. When that amount of \$10,000,000 is used up, without any further authorization it would automatically be replenished. If his bridge is constructed and your bridge is constructed and other bridges are constructed, it might amount to \$100,000,000. It is an unsound proposal. In my judgment, if it was essential to national defense, the Atomic Energy Commission that is building a railroad out there, at a cost of something more than a million dollars, as I recall, would have authority, as they did during the war, to construct it. Now, under the guise of providing an additional facility, the gentleman is offering an amendment which would bring forward the law that obtained during the war, that authorized the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, to construct at Federal expense—except that he would match it—military and other installations.

The committee considered the gentleman's proposal and I think properly rejected it.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES. In all due fairness to the gentleman's remarks, this is Nationwide. It does not pertain just to that particular area.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is that a question or a statement?

Mr. HOLMES. It is Nationwide.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But, in all fairness, it is intended to apply to the atomic energy project across the Columbia

River, because you are the only Member of Congress who has been before our committee in behalf of a project of this kind. We considered it carefully. We heard you at length, and, in all kindness, if the State of Washington is as much interested as you and the people of your district seem to be, they can match the fund and provide for an additional or longer bridge, just as they can do in many other cities out of Federal-aid funds apportioned to the States.

Mr. HOLMES. Of course, that is what they would do all over the Nation in relation to this amendment, in those acute defense areas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but in peacetime, under the guise of an atomic energy project, you are trying to get out of the funds appropriated for all the people in the United States, enough money set aside so that this bridge may be constructed. In my judgment, the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

(The CHAIRMAN called sections 10 to 13, inclusive, for amendment, but none was offered.)

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 14?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Public Works, with the direction to report the same back to the House forthwith, with a modest reduction of 20 percent in the annual amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 1 for Federal aid to highway construction.

The amount of the saving, if this motion should carry, would be \$100,000,000 a year for the 2 years involved, or a total of \$200,000,000.

By this amendment I seek to make a modest reduction of 20 percent in the annual amounts authorized to be appropriated under this program for Federal aid to highway construction. The amount of the saving, if the amendment is adopted, would be \$100,000,000 a year for the 2 years involved, or a total of \$200,000,000.

I would be less than frank were I not to admit at the outset that even if this motion should carry, I would still feel compelled to vote against the bill. The Members are entitled to that frank statement from me at the outset.

Two years ago, when our budget was balanced, we authorized an expenditure of \$450,000,000 a year for fiscal 1950 and 1951. Now, when we have been running for 2 years in the red to the tune of over \$5,000,000,000 a year, it is proposed to authorize for fiscal 1952 and 1953 even more—\$500,000,000 a year, or a total of \$1,000,000,000. In addition to that, of course, this bill carries with it authorizations for other road-construction projects not covered by my amendment, amounting to \$136,500,000 a year, or a total for the 2 years of \$273,000,000.

Good roads are, of course, vital to the welfare and progress of our great country. But the same argument may, with equal force, be advanced regarding many other features of our national life.

We have been presented by the committee, on pages 4 and 5 of the report, with a table showing the amount which each State will receive under this program. The last column gives the apportionment of the total figure of \$570,000,000, which is involved in sections 1 and 2, and the next-to-the-last column gives the apportionment of the \$500,000,000 figure involved in section 1 alone, to which my motion will be addressed.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others at the end of my remarks that they may inquire what amount their States would receive and what they pay.

Under this program, for instance, New York will receive \$31,700,000. But New York's contribution to all Federal-aid programs is 18.35 percent, so that New York citizens will pay \$91,700,000 in order to get back \$31,700,000 out of the \$500,000,000 fund.

Here are the figures on all the 14 States which contribute to Federal road programs more than they receive:

States	Percent contributed to Federal-aid programs	Amount contributed to \$500,000,000 Federal road program	Amount received Federal road program
California.....	7.3	\$36,500,000	\$26,800,000
Connecticut.....	1.59	7,000,000	4,800,000
Delaware.....	.76	3,800,000	2,000,000
Illinois.....	8.82	44,100,000	21,800,000
Kentucky.....	2.01	10,000,000	8,400,000
Maryland.....	2.64	13,200,000	4,900,000
Massachusetts.....	3.04	15,200,000	9,800,000
Michigan.....	6.34	31,700,000	17,000,000
New Jersey.....	2.84	14,200,000	9,500,000
New York.....	18.35	91,700,000	31,700,000
North Carolina.....	2.88	14,400,000	11,100,000
Ohio.....	6.49	32,400,000	19,500,000
Pennsylvania.....	7.64	39,700,000	23,600,000
Virginia.....	1.50	9,500,000	8,500,000

The charge may be made by one of the Members from the 34 States which contribute less than they receive under such Federal-aid programs that this attitude is provincial, and that, as Members of the national legislative body, we should look at all of these questions from the point of view of the national interest alone, without regard to their effect on our own constituents. Perhaps there is some merit in that argument. The difficulty is that provincialism is evidenced day in and day out most frequently and most clearly by those who are securing something for their own districts at the expense of everybody else. It is to offset that type of argument, almost daily heard in this body and the other body, that I have felt it desirable to call the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the States which I have enumerated, to the burden which they are casting upon the people in their own districts by favoring the measure before us, and opposing the motion which I shall offer.

Nor do I concede the charge which will be made that opposition to this bill and the proposal of this motion to recommit stems from an effort to protect only the taxpayers of a limited geographical area.

It seems to me it is the height of irresponsibility in the present precarious state of our Federal finances, faced as we are with inescapable commitments to preserve the security of our country for us, as representatives of all of the people of the United States, to vote an actual increase in authorizations for the construction of highways—surely one activity where prudence would dictate some pruning, rather than enlargement of expenditures.

Despite the honeyed words from high quarters, no responsible official connected with either our Defense Department or our Department of State envisions in the immediate future any substantial reduction in our budgetary provisions for the armed services. Indeed, all the talk, except that of a purely political character, is along the line of a possible increase in these commitments. In the present state of world affairs we dare not, we will not fail to make adequate provision for the needs of our armed services and research projects.

We are a mighty Nation, guarding not only our freedom but the freedom and hope of freemen everywhere. Nothing could be more false or more foolish than to cripple our armed services while the world is in its present state of turmoil and unrest.

In the meantime, however, it is imperative that we reduce our domestic expenses. Projects, buildings, roads, and plans which would have first priority in more normal times must be postponed until such time as we can afford them, or scaled down to meet the capabilities of our people. We are not free agents in the true sense, since a major part of our budget today is determined for us by the despotic rulers of a foreign power.

Our country is undoubtedly the wealthiest, most prosperous nation in the world at the present time, but we must not delude ourselves into thinking that we can afford to waste our wealth on a multitude of peacetime projects, in addition to bearing the tremendous burden of maintaining an adequate defense.

There comes a point in taxation where diminishing returns begin to result. To continue to further expand our economy and our prosperity we must not make the rate of taxation so high that people will not have the incentive to invest their money. In order to preserve our ability to support the Government by taxes we must maintain a sound and prosperous economy.

We must tailor our expenditures to meet the amount of income which the Government receives in the form of taxes. A sound fiscal policy, embracing a just rate of taxation and the practice of economy with regard to normal spending, is the soundest defense policy we can have.

We must not fritter away our wealth and our freedom for the short-lived benefit of special interest groups who put their sectional or political welfare above that of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, there could be no benefit in defeating communism abroad if we allow ourselves to slip into financial ruin here at home. Moreover, nothing would please the Kremlin and the Communists more than to have the United States, the stronghold of liberty and individual rights, become a victim of our own extravagance.

The reduction which I shall propose in my motion is modest indeed—only 20 percent off the \$500,000,000 figure, and only about 10 percent under the last authorization bill which we adopted.

Furthermore, since this is a planning bill for fiscal 1952 and 1953, it cannot successfully be contended that such a reduction will result in any interference with projects already under way. The time has come—indeed, long since was here—for us to begin to cut down on the always enticing, but surely destructive course of raising, year after year, the authorized expenditures for this, that, or the other Federal project. No harm can come to any community by this reduction. On the other hand, a reversal in our profligate policy will be hailed, not alone among those in the 14 States which I have enumerated, but throughout the country, as an indication that it is at long last sinking into our collective consciousness that if our country is to make substantial, constructive progress; if it is to build its future, not on the sands, but on a rock; if it is to maintain its position of world leadership and preserve, not only its own freedom but freedom throughout the world, it can only be done by the careful husbanding of our own resources and the prudent management of our own financial structure.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to have the gentleman quote the figures for Pennsylvania that he did for New York.

Mr. KEATING. Pennsylvania's percentage of contribution to Federal aid programs is 7.94 percent and the amount, therefore, which it contributes to the \$500,000,000 is \$39,700,000. For that \$39,000,000 plus it receives back \$23,600,000, or a difference of over \$13,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. May I point out to the gentleman that we had before our committee Mr. B. D. Towney, superintendent of public works for the State of New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the superintendent of public works of the State of New York appeared along with all the other superintendents of public works from other States in favor of this bill, I differ with him just the same as I differ with

the others. But I point out to my friend from Alabama that the New York State Assembly has passed a memorializing resolution which I inserted in the Record on May 9 and which will be found at page A3418. In that resolution the attention of the New York congressional delegation and others was drawn to the annual tendency to increase these Federal-aid programs—\$2,190,000,000 for fiscal 1949, over three billion for fiscal 1950, and approaching four billion for fiscal 1951. Stress was placed on the glaring discrimination and tremendous financial drain suffered by New York State taxpayers under these Federal-aid programs which we were importuned by this resolution to revise to remove the resulting inequities.

I feel reasonably sure that Governor Dewey and the New York State officials would agree with my position on this legislation but if not, with all due deference I must insist that I feel responsible for taking such action as my own conscience, not that of someone else, may dictate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course everyone admits that we must have highways, but it seems futile to attempt to build highways unless we have some more stringent regulations as to their use.

Driving from Washington to Michigan and also on the return trip, about 675 miles, a tally was kept of the passenger cars on the return trip and of the trucks on the highways. Much to my amazement, on the return trip it was learned that the trucks—and this is almost unbelievable—exceeded in number the passenger cars that met and passed us each way.

This also was learned, that in the villages and towns and cities where pavement had been laid some years ago and was of lighter construction, it was almost completely broken up; that only on the turnpike and perhaps one other stretch of road in Ohio was the pavement what might be now termed passable, usable.

Trucks on the highways apparently are growing larger each year and certainly their speed is increasing. Some trucks at least approximating in weight some of the freight cars.

One member of the State police, commenting upon the subject—and of course I cannot vouch for his accuracy, giving only what he said—stated that the blocks on the turnpike, if one watched them when there was a light rainstorm or when the blocks were wet, those large blocks tilted at the joints, spraying water when some of these trucks went over them.

If that is the condition, and those of you who travel on the main highways are as able as I am to judge, if that is the condition, and it appears to be, have we not reached the time when we must do something to limit the weight and the number of the trucks or build a special roadway for them?

It was only last fall, as I recall, when, coming down the turnpike, there was anywhere from a quarter to a half mile

of trucks lined up on the side of the highway. Evidently the State police had found the method of calling into the courts, those who were driving overweight vehicles on the highway and having them fined or occasionally imprisoned ineffectual to stop that practice. So these trucks were lined up, and many of them were being forced to unload before they would permit them to proceed. You can imagine what damage that was to the perishable freight.

That seemed to be the only effective way of controlling that practice of overloading which it was charged was destroying our highways, both State and federally built, to prevent their destruction by those who are using the highways for traffic lanes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Everything the gentleman has said is absolutely true, which is the strongest argument for this bill. Instead of \$500,000,000, it should be \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, well, why not make it \$10,000,000,000? Why not make it \$12,000,000,000? That kind of argument coming from that source is most surprising. What are the foundations of the gentleman's argument? Only that tax money is unlimited.

I have heard the gentleman express his opposition to appropriations abroad because we have to limit our contributions, because there is a bottom to the barrel somewhere; as to all other sources of supply of anything there is a bottom somewhere.

The gentleman is voicing the old fallacious argument, which I have so many times heard him so eloquently demolish, to wit, that the Federal Government has an inexhaustible source of supply—that there is no limit to the number of dollars that can be collected from taxpayers.

That, as the gentleman himself has often said, is errant nonsense.

If the gentleman is now correct, why not build four-lane highways on the main traveled routes throughout the country? Why not at least a black-top road to every farmhouse?

All are desirable. There is just one reason for not undertaking that program and that is that the money is not available and it cannot with safety to our Nation be made available.

I am not objecting to good highways. Of course, we should have them. The point, and the only point, which I am trying to make is that we should, by some fair and adequate means, at least make some effort to preserve the highways we have, to limit the use of the highways we build, in such manner that they will not be destructively used.

A highway can only sustain a certain load, the amount of which can be easily and accurately determined by engineers and experts.

I am not arguing that the trucks do not contribute by way of tax and license fees a fair sum for the use they make of the highways, for I lack the information

to express a worth-while opinion on that subject.

Permit me to express a doubt that some others who do express opinions on that topic have adequate information.

The point which I am arguing is—and I repeat—that, inasmuch as we all know that the highways will not withstand the pounding they get from ever-increasing loads, the Federal Government make a study of this subject; then build a highway which can adequately carry and withstand the traffic load which is permitted to travel over it.

A truck carrying a load equal to that of some freight cars certainly must be limited as to speed, and it must have a track which is equal to the burden of carrying the load.

Ordinary observation and common sense convince the observing and the thinking individual that highways built for passenger cars and light trucks at moderate speed cannot, with safety to the public or proper conservation of the roadway, be traveled by trucks carrying freight-car loads at express-car speed.

Let us get as much out of the dollar expended for highway purposes as we possibly can. That procedure means more and better roads for everyone.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all admire the ability and relish and appreciate the keen wit, and at times biting sarcasm and irony, of our good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Those of us who have been privileged to travel through Germany, which is not as large as the State of Texas, but which has 70,000,000 people, have been impressed with her superhighways, the autobahns. Regardless of what we think, however much we might despise and hate Hitler, he did one magnificent job in building autobahns all the way from Friedrichshafen and Mannheim down through Stuttgart and Karlsruhe to Munich, and then up north to Frankfurt, Cologne, and across to Bremen and Hamburg, and down to Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig, to Hannover and Nuremberg—all over the land, without a single lane coming into the main highway; all overheads and underpasses.

His great mistake was that he neglected his railroads.

I was amazed to find 20 years after being a student in Germany they had the same old rolling stock as when I was a student there. But everyone knows that the building of double-lane highways with a parkway between them, beautiful and not cluttered up with a lot of signs and advertisements, contributes much to the strength of a nation. If there is one thing in which we make a sound, solid investment, I think it is in the construction of roads in this country, which are so lamentably short and in such poor condition.

When you build highways there is absolutely no politics or discrimination involved. Old dealers, New Dealers, Democrats, Republicans, everybody drives over the highways. Every single Member of the Congress, whether you live 50 miles from Washington or 2,500 miles, drives over these highways. Some of our Members have been killed, too, in trying to get back to their duties here in the Capitol. Of course, I believe in economy, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan. Of course, I have voted against the dishing out of Government largess, particularly to the sending of checks to places where you need to be reelected. I know the Federal Government has been going into Missouri, and they are going into Illinois, and they will even go out to Wyoming and Idaho. They will collect \$1,000,000 from you in taxes and then after taking their toll here in Washington, they will send one-third of that amount back to you in checks, a few weeks before election, to keep themselves in power. It is a big brokerage fee.

No one is against that sort of practice more than I am. But here we have something that is sound, sane, sensible, and constructive. The able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who does not aspire to come back to the House of Representatives, and who is retiring after these many years of useful service, needs to be listened to, because he spelled it out here.

In answer to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], if you will study the table which is given in the report of the committee, I think the allocation to the different States is fair and equitable. Whether you are from New York or Missouri, when you drive across the country, of course you want good highways and you want bridges. This committee is composed of good men. They have carefully and cautiously considered every item in the bill. As I understand, it was reported unanimously as a result of the close cooperation between the able chairman [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and our distinguished and able friend from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I do not see that there should be any opposition to this bill, and I repeat, instead of providing for \$500,000,000, which today does not mean more than \$200,000,000 did 15 years ago, it should be much a larger amount. The Eightieth Congress voted \$1,500,000,000 for good roads; \$500,000,000 a year for 3 years and that was when we Republicans were in control.

I hope we vote on it shortly and pass it overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use this 5 minutes discussing this bill and the question of roads and trails.

First, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee to tell us as briefly as possible so as to conserve time, from what source the \$1,000,000,000 will come which is provided for in this bill for June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953? In other words, do I understand that the States will have to match the Federal Government to the extent of 50 percent of this figure?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For the year 1949 the Federal Government collected \$1,326,054,091 in user taxes of which \$503,648,471 were derived from the 1½-cent Federal gasoline tax. This bill authorizes \$500,000,000 for Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban roads to be matched by the States. It also authorizes \$70,000,000 with an increased Federal share to encourage construction on the interregional system. The Federal Government pays the entire cost of roads through parks; so, I would say that the people of the United States, the road users, are providing the funds in this bill. The Federal road user taxes amount to about a billion and a half a year, and the tax on gasoline alone at 1½ cents amounts to approximately \$500,000,000 annually which is the amount of the authorization for each of the 2 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That answers the question: The people who use the roads pay for the roads.

A few months ago we had a steel strike in this country. To keep the automobile factories running in the great State of Michigan it was necessary for the automobile manufacturers to use trucks and airplanes and railroads day and night pushing everything to the maximum to get steel on hand to accommodate payrollees working in the factories during the steel strike so that the automobile business would not have to shut down on account of the steel strike. We had a coal strike; we had a railroad strike a few days ago; and let me say something to all the Members of this House: We are not going to take the trucks off the highways of the United States now or later. Anybody ought to know that who knows anything about the economy of the country; anybody who thinks at all ought to know that the railroads alone cannot serve the economy of the United States.

Anybody ought to know we will have to build stronger roads and wider roads and more roads in order to accommodate the traffic of the United States if we are going to pay 50 percent of the obligations that we have agreed to pay.

The trucks that use the highways pay for the use of those highways, else you can place the responsibility right with the State public utilities commissions who control those trucks. There is no point in getting up here and kicking about the trucks using the highways. I have shipped too many goods all over this country by rail, air, and trucks. So rather than conceding to anybody that you are going to reduce the trucks that use the highways, I say you are going to put more trucks on the highways. If this Congress exercises good judgment in peacetime it will build highways that will accommodate tourist cars and trucks. In wartime, in time of emergency, when there are strikes in our great basic industries, we need these roads, and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] knows that just as well as I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why, sure, I know we need military highways.

Does the gentleman know what happened in Germany? The gentleman from Missouri spoke about the highways that Hitler built, and then told how his enemies came in and got into the very heart of the country. I have no grievance against the trucks except I want them to pay their fair share.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They are doing that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what the gentleman says.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I say they are doing that or the responsibility lies at the desk of the State public utilities commission. We do not regulate the trucks with respect to the amount they pay for a permit. Congress passes the laws which gives the trucks a chance to apply for an interstate permit so that they may cross State lines. We do not assess for the license plates that they have on that truck. The State public utilities commissions and the Federal regulatory commission assess the charges.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think the trucks are giving the railways that furnish their own rights-of-way some pretty severe competition just now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The demands of the traffic in the United States which supports the truck industry create a competitive condition with the railroads, so do the airlines create a competitive condition, so it is the waterways create a competitive condition, but nowhere among all those services have you enough transportation service today to serve the people of this country with expedition if strikes occur or if war is on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, replying to the gentleman from Michigan with respect to large trucks and large loads may I say that the States pay one-half of the cost of the Federal-aid highways. The States regulate the size of the trucks. A Member of Congress told me two weeks ago Sunday that in coming home he passed in one place a line of about 100 trucks, as he estimated, that were stopped by the authorities of Virginia because they were overloaded. The States levy taxes dependent upon size on trucks and buses. The authorities of the State of Virginia arrested and fined the operators of trucks violating State laws. So do authorities of other States. We want the laws enforced, but the enforcement of those laws and the policing of those highways is with the States.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the matter of Federal aid and with respect to some States paying more than they receive under the terms of this bill, there have been from time to time a few from several of the States who have opposed Federal aid. There have been some from New York, but what would the people of New York City do if they were not supported by the purchase of their manufactures by the people of the United States? The Union Pacific Railroad, as I recall, is located west of the Mississippi River, yet New York City gets credit for the income taxes that railroad pays, as the main offices and domicile of

the corporation are in New York. Many income and other Federal taxes are collected in New York, but they are based upon earnings in other States. Taxes on automobiles are collected in Michigan, but the people of other States pay the taxes. Michigan, like New York, gets credit for taxes that are paid in those States, but really earned in other States.

What about North Carolina? What about Virginia? No complaint about Federal aid comes from those and other States. Who pays the taxes that are collected in North Carolina on cigarettes and tobacco? While collected in North Carolina, while collected in New Jersey and Connecticut for insurance, fire, and life, while collected in Pennsylvania on steel, who pays the taxes that are remitted to the Federal Treasury from these States? Of course the answer is that the people of all the States pay taxes that are collected in North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, and other States.

For practically 20 years I have heard highway commissioners from practically every State in the United States from time to time. I have heard the few who oppose the money who advocate Federal aid and every 2 years I have seen the Congress of the United States overwhelming, if not unanimously, endorse the proposals of this bill. I think Congress was sound in making that endorsement.

There are no toll roads in this bill that are contributed to by the Federal Government.

In conclusion, permit me to say with respect to the contract features emphasized by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], if his contention were to prevail before any mile of road could be constructed in Georgia or in New York there would have to be a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations to determine whether or not that committee would approve the particular road. Under the terms of this bill, tried and tested under a procedure approved by the superintendent of roads of the State of New York, under the administration of Governor Dewey, the best method of the selection of roads has been worked out and tested over a period of more than 25 years, or since the enactment of the original act in 1921.

For my part, and I believe I speak for all the people of the United States, we would rather that the State highway department, with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads, select the roads than that any committee or subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress select them, because, among other good reasons, the States pay one-half the cost. I know that the terms of this bill, every provision in this bill, have been tried out. The sum of \$500,000,000 was authorized in 1944.

The two members in the other body who insisted on reducing that to \$450,000,000 after the House had passed it at \$500,000,000 in 1948 under the administration of my good friend George DONDERO, then chairman of the committee on Public Works in the House, than whom there is no finer man or no more valuable Member of Congress—when it

went to the other body, the pseudo-advocates of economy were destructive of real economy. The two men on that conference committee who insisted upon reducing that authorization, in the face of the fact that a road that now costs \$55,000,000 cost \$20,000,000 16 years ago, were defeated in the very next election that followed the approval of that conference report in 1948.

I know of no more satisfactory public work, and in all my experience, and I have piloted practically every Federal-Aid Highway Act through this House for the past 18 years, I have never submitted for your consideration a more constructive act, an act fairer to all the people and to all the States of the United States than the bill under consideration, which I trust will be passed.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 7941 which is the bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended. I am a member of the Public Works Committee which considered this bill and it was reported unanimously by the committee after extensive hearings and careful consideration by the committee. While the Public Works Committee desires to cooperate in a program of economy in order to curtail so far as possible public expenditures and keep the Federal budget in balance, yet after due consideration it felt that it could not, in deference to the welfare of the Nation, eliminate the necessary authorization for expenditures for the public roads of the United States. This bill merely carries out a program that has been in existence since 1921 providing Federal aid for construction of the highway system throughout the Nation. As a matter of fact appropriations authorized by this bill, while in dollars a little in excess of those heretofore appropriated annually, in road-construction accomplishment it is less than is usually appropriated by reason of the shrinkage in the construction dollar. As you are aware, it takes approximately \$3 now to provide road construction that could be secured with \$2 before the war.

Furthermore revenues from Federal gasoline, oil, and motor equipment taxes imposed on road users exceeds these moneys authorized for roads. In fact these taxes pay into the Federal Treasury almost three times as much as is authorized by this bill. As was pointed out by our chairman, a country without roads is a country which has never developed. Nations which provide for essential highways are nations which are in the forefront in civilization. With the advance in the construction of automobiles, trucks, and other motor vehicles, the necessity for good roads becomes essential. In fact, motorists who provide the funds by reason of the taxes levied on automobile equipment, gasoline, and oil are happy to do so if the funds thus procured are utilized in providing adequate roads for motor travel.

During the war, owing to the cessation of road construction except that necessary for the prosecution of the war, we lagged behind in keeping our highways abreast of the needs of the Nation. In fact, the roads have been wearing out

faster than replacement by new construction. We could well afford to authorize double the amount carried in this bill, and by so doing we would still lag behind in bringing the highway system of America up to standard and adequate for carrying the highway traffic.

While it is true trucks are using our highways extensively for the transportation of freight, not only between cities but for transcontinental traffic, the trucks are paying their way and are contributing to the Federal Treasury much larger sums than those needed to provide adequate highways for such traffic.

As reported by the committee, section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1952 and 1953. It divides the amount authorized for each of said fiscal years into three categories, namely, \$225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and \$125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas. It provides that said sums, respectively, for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. However, the provision in section 4 (b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, respecting the apportionment of the funds authorized by said act for secondary and feeder roads, requires that the population shown by the Federal census of 1940 shall be used. Since it is possible that population figures from the Federal census of 1950, which is now being taken, may be available by the time the first apportionment under the bill is made, provision has been inserted in section 1 that the census figures used shall be those shown by the latest available Federal census. This change makes the population figures that shall be used in apportioning funds for secondary roads the same as those required by section 4 (c) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 with respect to the apportionment of the funds therein provided for urban areas—that is, those shown by the latest available Federal census.

In addition to the foregoing, section 2 (a) of the bill would authorize the appropriation of the additional sum of \$70,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 for expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the national system of interstate highways. This is the first instance in which Congress has recognized the national system of interstate highways by authorizing an appropriation for expenditure exclusively on said system. This subsection provides that the sum authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, but that no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the sum apportioned for each fiscal year. It further provides that any State may use its apportionment of any funds now or hereafter authorized for

expenditure solely on the national system of interstate highways either to finance projects on said system on the regular matching basis, or to increase the Federal payment by one-half of the State's pro rata of the cost of any such project financed on the regular matching basis from Federal primary or urban funds. In other words, in a State in which the Federal pro rata is 50 percent, it would make it possible to finance a project on a 50-50 basis with regular primary or urban funds, and to increase the Federal share above the 50 percent pro rata by as much as one-half of the State's 50 percent.

Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that any State that may issue bonds and use the proceeds thereof for the construction of toll-free facilities in order to accelerate the improvement of the national system of interstate highways may apply any part of its apportionment of the funds now or hereafter authorized for expenditure on said system of highways for retiring the annual maturities of the principal indebtedness of such bonds. However, the facility constructed with the proceeds of such bonds would have to be constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved in advance by the Commissioner of Public Roads. A further safeguard is provided by requiring that payments to any State pursuant to this subsection shall be made exclusively from the State's apportionments of funds authorized for expenditure on such system of highways, and that the provision for such payments authorized by this subsection shall not be construed as a commitment or obligation on the part of the United States to provide such funds.

The bill also provides for park roads and trails which lie exclusively within federally owned lands, and therefore should be constructed and maintained by the Federal Government.

In the Pacific Northwest, where large stands of marketable timber still exist, there is critical need of the construction and maintenance of adequate forest highways not only to protect the forests, a large percentage of which is owned by the Federal Government, but also to permit the marketing of forest products as the timber becomes ripe and available for marketing.

This bill covers a period of 2 years, which, with the existing authorization remaining 1 year, makes a 3-year period, which is necessary to permit the States to formulate programs and enact the necessary legislation to secure matching funds to meet these requirements. Without an extended period of this kind it would be impossible for the various States of the Union to meet the matching provisions and provide the necessary funds to enable them to carry on a continuous program of road construction.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this bill is a good bill, one that is in keeping with program of road construction for the internal development of our Nation which have been carried on for years, and one which is more than self-supporting in that road users provide the funds to meet the payments authorized in the bill. For that reason I am glad to give it my support.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest interests that I have had in helping to formulate legislation since coming to Congress in 1946 is to assist in every way possible to provide a Federal-aid road program which will be a progressive one to meet the ever-changing needs for our highway system. Just since World War II there have been changed conditions and the House Public Works Committee has properly provided for an authorization of expenditure for an interstate highway system to supplement the present aid to primary, secondary, and urban road construction.

H. R. 7941 authorizes the appropriation of \$500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 and divides the amount 45 percent, or \$225,000,000, for primary roads; 30 percent, or \$150,000,000, for secondary roads, which includes our farm-to-market roads; and 25 percent, or \$125,000,000, on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas. To this is added the additional sum of \$70,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years to expedite construction on the national system of interstate highways.

The legislatures of 45 States, which includes Texas, will meet in regular biennial session in 1951. This makes it imperative that Federal-aid funds for continuing the program of highway construction be authorized during this session of the Congress in order that funds for matching the Federal funds may be made available by the State legislatures that will be in session. The moneys to cover these authorizations are derived from the Federal gasoline tax, and the \$32,042,000 earmarked for Texas represents a return of the taxpayers' money, of which \$10,074,000 is to be used for improvement of our farm-to-market roads.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the favorable consideration of this legislation, H. R. 7941, and hope that it will pass unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7941) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 565, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEATING. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. **KEATING** moves to recommit H. R. 7941 to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the same back forthwith to the House with the following amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$225,000,000" and insert "\$180,000,000."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$120,000,000."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

Mr. **WHITTINGTON**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. **KEATING**) there were—ayes 24, noes 113.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. **TABER**) there were—ayes 140, noes 18.

Mr. **TABER**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thinks a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 34, not voting 152, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—246

Abernethy	Christopher	Grant
Addonizio	Clemente	Green
Allen, La.	Clevenger	Gregory
Andersen,	Colmer	Gross
H. Carl	Combs	Hagen
Andersen,	Cooper	Hale
August H.	Corbett	Harden
Andrews	Cox	Hardy
Angell	Crawford	Hare
Aspinall	Crook	Harris
Auchincloss	Crosser	Harrison
Barrett, Wyo.	Cunningham	Havener
Bates, Ky.	Curtis	Hays, Ark.
Battle	Davis, Tenn.	Hays, Ohio
Beall	Davis, Wis.	Hedrick
Beckworth	Delaney	Heffernan
Bennett, Mich.	Denton	Herlong
Bentsen	D'Ewart	Hill
Biemiller	Dollinger	Hoffman, Ill.
Bishop	Dondero	Holmes
Eackney	Donohue	Hope
Blatnik	Doughton	Horan
Boggs, Del.	Eberhart	Howell
Boggs, La.	Elliott	Huber
Bolling	Ellsworth	Hull
Bolton, Md.	Evins	Jackson, Wash.
Bosone	Fallon	Javits
Breen	Fellows	Jenkins
Brehm	Flood	Jensen
Brooks	Fogarty	Johnson
Brown, Ga.	Forand	Jonas
Bryson	Ford	Jones, Ala.
Buckley, Ill.	Fugate	Jones, Mo.
Burdick	Fulton	Jones, N. C.
Burke	Furcolo	Karst
Burleson	Garmatz	Karsten
Burnside	Gary	Kee
Byrnes, Wis.	Gathings	Kelley, Pa.
Cannon	Golden	Kelly, N. Y.
Carnahan	Gordon	Kerr
Carroll	Gorski	Kilday
Chelf	Gossett	Kling
Chipfield	Granger	Lane

Lanham	O'Hara, Minn.	Steed
Larcade	O'Konski	Stefan
Lenke	O'Neill	Stockman
Lesinski	O'Sullivan	Sullivan
Lind	O'Toole	Sutton
Linehan	Patman	Tackett
Lovre	Patten	Talle
McCarthy	Perkins	Tauriello
McCormack	Peterson	Teague
McCulloch	Philbin	Thomas
McGregor	Pickett	Thornberry
McGuire	Poage	Tollefson
McMillan, S. C.	Polk	Trimble
Mack, Ill.	Preston	Underwood
Mansfield	Price	Van Zandt
Marcantonio	Priest	Velde
Marsalis	Rains	Vinson
Marshall	Ramsay	Vorys
Martin, Mass.	Rankin	Vursell
Mason	Redden	Walter
Meyer	Reed, Ill.	Welchel
Michener	Rees	Werdell
Miller, Md.	Regan	Wheeler
Miller, Nebr.	Robeson	Whitaker
Mills	Rodino	Whitten
Mitchell	Rogers, Fla.	Whittington
Morris	Rogers, Mass.	Wier
Morrison	Rooney	Williams
Moulder	Sanborn	Willis
Multer	Sasser	Wilson, Ind.
Murdock	Saylor	Wilson, Okla.
Murray, Tenn.	Scrivner	Wilson, Tex.
Murray, Wis.	Shelley	Winstead
Nelson	Short	Withrow
Noland	Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott
Norblad	Smith, Kans.	Wolverton
Norrell	Smith, Va.	Yates
Norton	Smith, Wis.	Young
O'Brien, Ill.	Spence	Zablocki
O'Brien, Mich.	Stanley	

NAYS—34

Bates, Mass.	Hoffman, Mich.	Sadlak
Canfield	James	St. George
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Shafer
Coudert	Keating	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kunkel	Taber
Elston	Latham	Towe
Fenton	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Gamble	Lucas	Wagner
Gavin	Nicholson	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Graham	Ribicoff	
Heseltun	Rich	

NOT VOTING—152

Abbitt	Fisher	Mack, Wash.
Albert	Frazier	Macy
Allen, Calif.	Gillette	Madden
Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Magee
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Mahon
Arends	Granahan	Martin, Iowa
Bailey	Guill	Merron
Barden	Gwinn	Miles
Baring	Hall	Miller, Calif.
Barrett, Pa.	Edwin Arthur	Monroney
Bennett, Fla.	Hall	Morgan
Bolton, Ohio	Leonard W.	Morton
Bonner	Halleck	Murphy
Bramblett	Hand	Nixon
Brown, Ohio	Hart	O'Hara, Ill.
Buchanan	Harvey	Pace
Buckley, N. Y.	Hébert	Passman
Bulwinkle	Heller	Patterson
Burton	Herter	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Joseph L.
Camp	Hobbs	Pfeiffer
Carlyle	Hoever	William L.
Case, N. J.	Hollifield	Phillips, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Irving	Phillips, Tenn.
Cavalcante	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Celler	Jacobs	Potter
Chatham	Jonison	Poulson
Chesney	Jennings	Powell
Chudoff	Judd	Quinn
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Rabaut
Cooley	Kearns	Rhodes
Cotton	Keefe	Richards
Davenport	Kennedy	Riehlman
Davies, N. Y.	Keogh	Rivers
Davis, Ga.	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kirwan	Sabath
Deane	Klein	Sadowski
DeGraffenried	Kruse	Scott, Hardie
Dingell	LeCompte	Scott,
Dolliver	Lichtenwalter	Hugh D., Jr.
Douglas	Lodge	Scudder
Doyle	Lyle	Secrest
Durham	Lynch	Sheppard
Eaton	McConnell	Sikes
Engel, Mich.	McDonough	Sims
Engle, Calif.	McGrath	Smathers
Feighan	McKinnon	Smith, Ohio
Fernandez	McMillen, Ill.	Stagers
	McSweeney	Stigler

Taylor	White, Calif.	Wood
Thompson	White, Idaho	Woodhouse
Walsh	Wickersham	
Welch	Widnall	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abbutt for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Mack of Washington for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Jenison against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Lodge against.
Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Cotton against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Herter against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Widnall against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Hart with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Baring with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Kruse with Mr. Potter.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Phillips of California.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Sims with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Wood with Mr. LeCompte.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Madden with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Merron.
Mr. Deane with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Guill.

Mr. **FENTON** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **WHITTINGTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the highway bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8567) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2113), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8568) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2114), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STOCKMAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 476) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which is tied to the bill which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] has just reported, and which, if adopted, will make available to the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Security Agency, and the various departments of government funds which might be necessary to meet the payrolls, the pensions, and that sort of thing, that otherwise could not be met, since it is necessary to have these funds available on the 24th of May.

Mr. CANNON. That is true. The joint resolution merely makes available for immediate needs funds carried in the deficiency bill now pending in the Senate.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this appropriate any money? If so, what are the amounts and the purposes for which it is to be spent?

Mr. CANNON. No definite funds are specified here, but provision is made to take care of current needs in anticipation of appropriations provided by the coming deficiency bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Missouri give the House a little more complete explanation of why a resolution such as this is necessary at this stage of the game?

Mr. CANNON. Under normal conditions, Mr. Speaker, we would have considered the deficiency bill long ago, but it could not be taken up until the general appropriation bill was disposed of and due to unexpected delays in the consideration of the general appropriation bill and the unexpected prolongation of that consideration we have not been able to reach the deficiency bill until now. If we had considered the general appropriation bill upon the date originally set for its consideration and had disposed of it in a reasonable time, this resolution would not have been necessary, but due to the unexpected delay we are reaching pay days for veterans' pensions, old-age pensions, and Federal salaries which cannot be provided in time by the belated deficiency bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to enable the departments, agencies, and corporations for which funds of authorizations are provided in H. R. 8567, Eighty-first Congress, the deficiency appropriation bill, 1950, to pay the compensation of civilian personnel, and the pay and allowances of military personnel, of such departments, agencies, and corporations, and to pay, or contribute toward the payment of, sums provided in said bill for the making of payments to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law: Provided, That in no event shall the amounts expended under the foregoing exceed the amounts provided in such bill as passed by the House of Representatives: Provided further, That the amounts expended under the foregoing shall be charged against the respective appropriations contained in said bill when it shall have been enacted into law: And provided further, That the Senate may

authorize, by resolution, expenditures for the fiscal year 1950, for items under contingent expenses of the Senate, for which estimates may be pending before Congress, and not acted upon, on May 17, 1950, but in no event shall such expenditures exceed the amounts of such estimates and such amounts as may be necessary for such expenditures are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, due to the unexpected delay in the submission and consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill for 1950, we find current appropriations will be exhausted on the 24th of this month and there will not be sufficient funds for the payment of veterans' pensions due on that date. It is estimated by the end of the fiscal year we will require \$220,000,000 additional for veterans' pensions. Under this joint resolution there will be expended approximately \$35,000,000 before the deficiency bill becomes law.

The funds from which old-age pensions are to be paid have also been depleted and we will be unable to meet the payments due the first of the coming month. About \$40,000,000 will be required for that purpose by the time the deficiency bill can be messaged to the President.

In addition, there is another item seldom called to attention, but which is important, embracing funds for the payment of witnesses in the Federal courts. We will require an additional \$185,000 between now and the end of the fiscal year to provide for payment of witnesses. Grand juries are now in session, and their work will be seriously hampered if funds are not provided to pay expenses of their witnesses.

And last, Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, we passed 15 bills amending the pay acts—15 bills increasing salaries. This increase in expenses was, of course, unforeseen and could not be provided for in the annual bill, and consequently employees cannot be paid for the coming month unless the deficiency is provided.

In order to take care of these immediate and urgent needs, Mr. Speaker, estimated to require in the aggregate approximately \$155,185,000, the Committee on Appropriations submits the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 568) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7579) to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply provides for the consideration of H. R. 7579, which itself provides for the extension of the Rubber Act of 1948 for 3 years.

The Rubber Act of 1948 expires on June 30 of the present year. During World War II the Government expended approximately \$700,000,000 to construct synthetic-rubber facilities. At the end of hostilities we were capable of producing 900,000 long tons of synthetic rubber per year. There still remains in Government ownership, facilities capable of producing above 850,000 long tons of synthetic rubber.

The committee reporting this bill in its report has this to say:

It is the unanimous conclusion of the Armed Services Committee that world conditions at this time do not warrant the disposal of any of the synthetic-rubber facilities in the present Government rubber program. The committee agrees completely with the principle of free enterprise and strongly endorses the eventual turning over of the Government-owned facilities for the production of synthetic rubber to private industry, but it is of the opinion that such a course of action is not in the best interests of national security at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, on the last roll call I did not hear my name called. I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded in opposition to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). May the Chair state the gentleman can make that statement for the RECORD, but unless the gentleman was present and voting, he cannot, under the rules, show that he answered to the roll call.

EXTENDING THE RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule and I am in favor of this bill. I do not know of an operation of the Government which has been carried on during the past 15 or 20 or 25 years that has proved any more beneficial or which has operated any more satisfactorily to the consumers of this country than has been the administration of the synthetic rubber program generally.

Since the war closed in July 1945, the people of this country have had the great privilege of re-tiring their old cars and of purchasing millions of new tires and cars without having to pay anything like an exorbitant price for rubber tires on automobiles and trucks. This has been the direct result of the establishment during the war of the synthetic rubber industry in this country, which cost our people something like \$750,000,000, and which created a capacity of synthetic rubber production in excess of 900,000 tons of rubber per year. That domestic production made our people independent of the purchase of rubber in great quantities from the so-called British, Dutch, and French rubber trusts of the Malay Straits of the Far East. Synthetic rubber has been available during these postwar years at a price of 17 cents to 18 cents plus per pound. That is cheap rubber in any man's country today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that the rubber market on natural rubber per pound is 25 cents and on synthetic rubber per pound is 18½ cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is correct. We do not have to have all of our rubber requirements in the form of raw rubber; synthetic rubber has progressed to a point where in many instances and for many purposes it is more acceptable to our people than is the natural product.

The Far East is many, many miles from the United States rubber-consuming market. We are the greatest consumers of rubber in the world. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] pointed out awhile ago, many of those who support this rule and who will support the bill are in favor of private enterprise in synthetic-rubber operations, but I think both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Armed Services believe that this is not the opportune moment to transfer these synthetic-rubber plants to private ownership on the basis which has been requested.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was glad to hear the gentleman say that he favored this bill. Several years ago we had a very exhaustive investigation of the rubber problem and our needs. I was a member of the subcommittee and had the pleasure of hearing the gentleman from Michigan make some comments on the rubber situation. Apparently, the gentleman from Michigan has made a very exhaustive study of rubber problems. I should like to have him make just a

brief comment as to whether or not he thinks carrying out this program proposed by this bill will finally make us almost independent of the markets from five to six thousand miles away from the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the program which has been carried out and which is now in operation would make us, for all practical purposes, absolutely independent of the far eastern rubber producing area. But there is another element in this situation which comes in through the State Department and through our international relations which operates contrary to that possibility. By that I mean that many of our departments of Government, and perhaps the administration, are very much in favor of our purchasing raw rubber in quantities from the Far East in order to put dollar exchange in the hands of those people over there. The gentleman from California has raised a question which gets into the whole relationship between the United States and the countries constituting southeastern Asia and the new United States of Indonesia. We are moving in the direction of very substantially supporting those countries through funds such as ECA or Marshall plan funds, or funds in that general classification, such as Export-Import Bank credits, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question we will face as rubber consumers is whether or not we desire to produce the great quantity of tonnage of rubber we consume in peacetime or whether we want to go to the Far East and purchase natural rubber, holding down the production of synthetic rubber and spending our dollars in the Far East.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman believe that this will give us practical independence of foreign markets and greater defense protection?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman mentioned 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber capacity. Can the gentleman tell the committee to what extent our petroleum resources are depleted by such production? I understand that the principal ingredients for synthetic rubber come from petroleum. How much will the production of 850,000 tons a year of synthetic rubber injure our petroleum resources?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me point out to the gentleman that we are not producing at that rate—

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Suppose we did.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Therefore the drain is not so heavy on petroleum. Now, suppose we did; suppose we could not get any rubber from the Far East and that we had to shove our synthetic production to the maximum using petroleum products for the production of the synthetic

rubber; if the petroleum production began to grow scarce we could then switch into the production of agricultural products from which we could draw the raw material with which to produce synthetic rubber. We have here in the United States in agriculture, or you might say in minerals from the soil and crops grown in the soil, what might be termed an unlimited supply of the basic raw materials for the production of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman appreciates that our petroleum resources are wasting assets, they are depleting. Rubber is something that grows annually.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Would it not be better to use something we can replace than to use something that is irreplaceable?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to see synthetic rubber made from agricultural products so as to take out of competition some of the surpluses in foodstuffs, such as fats, oils, and fiber, which we are now producing and which puts a load on the Federal Treasury in the form of subsidy operations and letting them go into synthetic rubber. We also have a so-called surplus of petroleum products. You have a question with which the Government departments are dealing all the time. Let me remind the gentleman from Idaho, because this is interesting to his State, that we also have in the far West or Central West or the Rocky Mountain area billions of tons of oil shale from which you can draw the basic products from which you can make synthetic rubber. So we have no shortage in that respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The objection is raised concerning the high cost of producing rubber from surplus agricultural products.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true they will never get the cost down without trying it, without putting it in motion, so that the genius of the country can really go at the business of producing low-cost alcohol and low-cost rubber?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think there is a good deal to what the gentleman says. But at the moment you are attempting to put synthetic rubber on the market, as our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said, at a price of around 18 to 18½ cents per pound, which is cheap rubber. We have millions of automobile users, something like forty-four or forty-five million vehicles registered in this country, who want low-cost tires, which they are getting today. Here is what I mean by that: I have on my 1941 Buick, parked out here in the lot, a set of synthetic-rubber tires, and I have driven the car with those tires 46,000 miles. Those

tires cost me less than \$17 per tire, purchased in Detroit, Mich. Now, that is tire service. They are made from synthetic rubber, which, in turn, was made from petroleum products, and the car has traveled 45,000 miles since I put them on the car.

A lot of our people are sympathetic to using agricultural products for the production of synthetic rubber. I think we should indulge in more experimentation perhaps than we are doing at the present time. I think we should have a pilot plant operating on that in order to determine exactly what can be done because I think the day will come when we will be short of petroleum products as such at which time we will switch over into the lignite field and the oil shale field. But if we do that on a big scale we will need 16,000,000 tons of steel to build the plants, we will need \$9,000,000,000 of new risk or investment capital with which to construct those plants.

Who is going to put up the \$9,000,000,000? Is the Federal Treasury going to finance it out of the general fund, borrowing the money or taxing the people, or is it to be operated in such a way that individual enterprisers will put up that risk capital or investment capital and build the plants with which to take the fuel oil from the oil shale and lignite? I think we can do that on about as low a cost basis as we can take the petroleum from the oil well. Those are the various phases of this thing.

I am sure that the Committee on the Armed Services has all of these things in mind, that its members are considering them. I think the committee has acted wisely in bringing this particular resolution and this particular bill to the floor for approval at this time so that we can take a further look into all of these things.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the gentleman and I am supporting the bill. I would not in any sense minimize the importance of research in the laboratory, but the way to get the cost down is through pilot plants and through actual operations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. Does the gentleman know of any individual who is willing to put up the money other than coming to the Federal Treasury to build those pilot plants, run this experiment, put the product on the market, and sell it competitively with the petroleum products?

Mr. CURTIS. Not under our present tax structure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to bring out. Now, the gentleman from Nebraska has really raised an important point.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 7579) to extend the Rubber Act of 1943 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1943 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.) is amended (1) by striking out "April 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1952", and (2) by striking out "January 15, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 15, 1953."

(b) Section 20 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, at the outbreak of World War II, this Nation was faced with a serious shortage of natural rubber. In fact, our natural rubber supply was so deficient that the taxpayers of this Nation spent over \$700,000,000 to build 51 complex, highly technical facilities for the manufacture of synthetic rubber. These plants were so effective that before the end of the war they had attained a capacity to produce over 900,000 long tons of synthetic rubber; they produced over 85 percent of our wartime rubber requirements.

The entire program was a magnificent demonstration of American ingenuity, industry teamwork, and above all, an everlasting tribute to American technical skill and to the American workman.

At the conclusion of the war, many of these plants were declared surplus and 18 of them were sold to private industry. These 18 plants were worth, at the time of their sale, approximately \$165,000,000. We received in return for the sale of these plants some \$57,000,000. Today, we still have in our synthetic rubber program 28 facilities. There are five other facilities that have been declared surplus, but not yet sold.

Of these 28 facilities, 17 are in actual operation, consisting of 8 copolymer plants with a total annual design capacity of 345,000 long tons, 2 butyl plants with a capacity of 68,000 long tons, 4 butadiene plants capable of producing 241,000 short tons annually, 1 styrene plant with a design capacity of 25,000 short tons, and 2 miscellaneous plants involving a pilot laboratory and a DDM plant.

These plants, in general, are operated for the Government through the Office of Rubber Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by private rubber, chemical, and petroleum companies. They are paid a fee based upon a quantity production determined by the Government.

In addition, there are five copolymer plants with an annual capacity of 243,000 long tons and six butadiene plants with a capacity of 248,000 tons in stand-by. All told, the present Government rubber program involves a plant investment of about \$470,000,000.

The bill before this committee today would extend the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1943, which expires on June 30 of this year, for a period of 3 years. In other words, this bill would continue Government ownership of these 28 highly significant facilities, which are capable of

producing over 665,000 tons of synthetic rubber and without which this Nation could not possibly wage a successful war.

In 1948, when the temporary wartime powers which authorized allocation and specification controls were about to expire, the Congress enacted the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948. This act provides that the President shall require the production and consumption of not less than 200,000 long tons of general-purpose synthetic and not less than 22,000 tons of special-purpose synthetic rubber annually in the United States. The law further provides that the Government shall retain the ownership of rubber-producing facilities having the capacity to produce 665,000 tons of synthetic rubber annually.

This is the law which we are asking the House to extend for another 3 years. This is the law which has proved satisfactory to all concerned and which has assured this Nation of an adequate supply of synthetic rubber. This is the law that makes us practically independent of foreign nations for our source of rubber.

The 1948 act also required the President to submit recommendations with regard to the disposal of these facilities and such other recommendations as he saw fit on January 15, 1950. In 1948 the law envisioned the possibility that world conditions might, by this time, have warranted the disposal of these facilities to private industry. In 1948 it seemed possible that world conditions might become sufficiently normal to have permitted such disposal. This was before the cold war. This was before the Berlin blockade. This was before a Navy Privateer was shot down by Russian fighter planes. This was before the Communists took over the Far East. This was before the natural-rubber-producing areas of the world were threatened with complete Communist domination.

The President submitted his recommendations on January 15, 1950, and, after careful consideration, the committee decided that the present law provides far greater security for the Nation than the President's proposals. Under the legislative recommendations of the President, there would have been no statutory minimum of required production and consumption of synthetic rubber. Under the present law, the President must require the consumption of not less than 222,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

Thus, under the present law, we have at least assured the manufacturer of a minimum production of synthetic rubber. This in turn protects the American consumer. Of even greater significance, however, is the fact that the present law requires a stated minimum of production and consumption. It is not subject to the whims and caprices of administrators concerned with foreign dollar shortages. Under the present law, no one can allow the synthetic industry to wither and die just to add a few more dollars to foreign rubber interests.

At this point, I think the House should know that natural rubber today is selling for 9 to 10 cents a pound more than synthetic rubber. Can you visualize what the price would be if we were to permit this industry to disintegrate?

The President's legislative recommendations likewise were seriously deficient in that they failed to contain a specific statutory stand-by capacity to be maintained at all times in the United States.

Note carefully that under the present law, the Government must maintain the ownership of facilities capable of producing not less than 665,000 tons of synthetic rubber. The present law is definite and emphatic. The President's recommendations were nebulous and uncertain.

In addition, the President's recommendations, in carefully worded terms, recommended the disposal of these facilities to private industry. But these recommendations were surrounded with so many qualifications and so-called safeguards that it is highly unlikely that any of the plants would have been sold. In fact, not one single rubber manufacturer who appeared before the subcommittee expressed an interest in purchasing any of these facilities under the President's proposals.

A Government witness who appeared in support of the Government's program even stated that he did not know of any company that was interested in purchasing any of these facilities. It would appear, therefore, that while the President recommended disposal, his proposal, if adopted, would have had the practical effect of turning the entire program over to the President to do with as he saw fit. Let me quote some of the language in the President's legislative recommendations:

Disposal for the production of synthetic rubber or component materials of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities shall be subject to the following:

1. Facilities for the production of general-purpose synthetic rubber or component materials thereof may be sold or leased only when, in the judgment of the President, the disposal would be consistent with the development of effective competition.

2. In disposing of facilities for the production of general-purpose synthetic rubber and component materials, every effort consistent with the objectives of this act shall be made to dispose of a maximum number of such facilities to persons determined by the President to be not dominant in their respective industries.

3. At least one facility for the production of general-purpose synthetic rubber shall be disposed of under this act to a person determined by the President to be not dominant in the rubber products industry before disposal of the other such facilities.

4. Except upon a finding by the President that such a disposal would be consistent with the development of effective competition, no person shall be permitted to purchase or lease both a Government-constructed rubber-producing facility for the production of general-purpose synthetic rubber and one for the production of butadiene, if such person is a producer of feed stocks for either butadiene or styrene or is a manufacturer of rubber products.

5. No more than one facility for the manufacture of butyl rubber shall be sold or leased for the production of butyl to a person determined by the President to be dominant in its industry, except upon a finding by the President that other disposal is impractical and that disposal to a person dominant in that industry is in the public interest.

6. The President is authorized to provide as a condition of disposal, a requirement

that whenever the exercise of the controls authorized by subsection 6 (a) of this act is found by the President to be necessary to meet the established minimum quantities of production and consumption, a percentage of the output of synthetic rubber or butadiene of that facility be available for sale to meet requirements resulting from the exercise of such controls. The President is further authorized to specify the products to be sold in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and to establish fair prices therefor on the basis of all relevant factors.

And coupled with these restrictions and complete surrender of congressional jurisdiction over this highly significant problem was the fact that the President's recommendation proposed 10-year legislation. In other words, we were asked to turn over the entire synthetic-rubber program to the President to do with as he saw fit for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, we should not surrender the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States over this problem to anyone for 10 years.

I want to talk about that for a minute.

It involves a very important principle of government in this country.

It brings us again to the question of delegation of the powers and duties of the Congress to the executive branch. It is a question which goes to the root of our system of government.

I say that the Congress cannot continue along this path of abdicating its proper functions to the executive branch. Continuous delegation of congressional authority to the Executive will ultimately deprive our people of any congressional control at all.

There are 150,000,000 American people who go to the polls every 2 years to elect their Representatives in Congress. I will never be able to believe that they expect their Representatives and Senators to capitulate to the multitude of nonelected officials in the vast Government departments and pass to them the functions and authority properly vested in the legislative branch.

So, I have taken the position on this rubber question, and on all other matters pertaining to national defense, that the basic responsibility is vested in the Congress—that it is a nondelegable responsibility—and, therefore, that the Congress, in a matter of this sort, cannot properly vest in the executive branch enormous discretionary powers.

That is the yardstick the Armed Services Committee has applied to the executive branch recommendations in regard to disposing of the Nation's synthetic-rubber facilities.

Almost the entire rubber manufacturing industry opposed the President's recommendations. Now, let no one in the House conclude that our committee was guided by what industry desired. Industry suggested three legislative proposals, all of which are described in the committee report, but none of them were acceptable to the committee. Of the three plans, two of them would have permitted the leasing of the present facilities, while the third would have provided for a statutory reduction in specification controls.

The committee's position is that there should be no disposal at this time either by lease or sale, although the committee

does agree that specification controls can be lowered in view of the relatively large and consistent consumption of synthetic rubber. This can be accomplished under the present law. One point should be made definitely clear. The committee is emphatic in its position that this is not the time to dispose of any of our facilities or to change the present law in any manner.

While it is true that, under the present law, facilities could possibly be leased, the committee notes that no facilities have been leased for the manufacture of general-purpose or butyl rubber, and it is our hope that the present law will remain as written and that it will be administered substantially as it has been in the past.

The present law has worked effectively and for the best interests of the Nation. No one has found any important flaw in it, nor has anyone made any great complaint about its operation. Three years hence, the entire subject will be reviewed. But the committee is unwilling to surrender its jurisdiction over this subject for 10 years, as recommended by the President.

All persons involved, including industry and Government, admit that the present Rubber Act of 1948 provides for national security in rubber. With the international situation such as it is, we feel that it is better to keep intact a law that has proved itself. This is no time to experiment with changes in a law that so far has provided the Nation with an adequate supply of synthetic rubber, and at the same time permitted us to stockpile natural rubber.

The declaration of policy on the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1943 says, in part, that Government ownership of production facilities, Government production of synthetic rubber, and regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber should be terminated whenever consistent with national security.

Mr. Speaker, our committee does not believe that this is the time to get the Government out of the synthetic rubber business.

In our opinion, it would not be consistent with national security to dispose of these facilities, stop Government production, or eliminate control authority at this time.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the House of Representatives more strongly favors private enterprise than I. And I think I can speak for the entire membership of the House Committee on Armed Services when I say that we all sincerely hope the day will soon come when the Government can get out of the rubber business entirely.

But we have a good law in effect now; it is providing security in rubber, the program is operating at a profit, and so far, the Office of Rubber Reserve has not asked Congress to appropriate any money to support the operating end of the rubber program. The taxpayers today are getting good products at fair prices; the tire on your car today is better than the tire before the war. But above all, we are maintaining, through our Government rubber program, an essential in-

dustry, second to none in our national defense.

If we fail to enact this legislation, the Government will go out of the rubber business on July 1, 1950. Plants will be declared surplus and the future of the synthetic rubber industry, as well as the security of the Nation, will be jeopardized.

The Armed Services Committee is emphatic and unanimous in its position that this is not the time to dispose of any of our synthetic rubber facilities or to change the present law in any manner.

This issue is before the Congress today because we hoped 2 years ago—as we did on the Selective Service Act as well—that world conditions today would be greatly improved. We hoped 2 years ago that by this time we would have arrived at some degree of accord and comity in international life.

But the 2 years have passed, and what do we find?

Why, every Member of this House knows that we are no nearer a lasting peace today than we were 2 years ago.

It is my opinion, and I say this advisedly, that we are further away than we were.

Even in recent months our relations with Russia have hit a new low. An American Navy plane has just been shot down carrying to their deaths the 10 members of the crew. The Soviets have just demanded our ouster from Trieste. They are abetting endless friction with our people in the satellite countries and evidently are seeking our complete retirement from that region, including, even, our diplomatic representatives.

They have taken China. They have taken the island of Hainan. Communists are carrying on a bloody civil war in Indochina. Conditions are increasingly serious in Burma, Malaya, Thailand.

We have before us now a threatened pressure play on Berlin which could be extremely serious.

And so, on and on.

We find our Secretary of State and our Defense Establishment officials warning us daily of tense and dangerous world conditions. They have warned repeatedly that Russia today respects only force. We are expending enormous sums in an effort to keep up our defense forces to counter the very active threat we face in today's world. Only a short while ago this House increased by \$383,000,000 the defense appropriation specifically in response to the need for adequate defense in this critical time in world affairs.

Our Secretary of State is heavily engaged in efforts designed to strengthen western Europe in the face of the mighty Russian military machine looming just over the horizon. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have just returned from the Hague after attending conferences seeking to increase the military strength of the free countries in Europe.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not that happy period in world affairs that we hoped for 2 years ago.

Quite the contrary. As the Armed Services Committee was told only a few days ago by the Secretary of Defense,

by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, and by others, world conditions have deteriorated even during the past 5 months.

So, there can be no doubt that this is not the time to dispose of our synthetic rubber plants, one of our most precious national defense assets.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. We are told that the ordinary rubber tire we have today is largely composed of synthetic rubber. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I know a good deal about that. The gentleman has stated it absolutely correctly. That is one reason why it is necessary for the time being to continue this law, because of the important part rubber plays in national defense. We could not operate a modern army or modern airplanes without tires.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman tell us what effect the production of 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber might have on the petroleum resources of this country?

Mr. VINSON. It might make a considerable draft on them but it would not deplete them to such an extent that, under regulations, we would not have sufficient to carry on the necessary production of airplanes and motor vehicles.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Without considering the production of synthetic rubber for defense, but considering only its use commercially today, there is a considerable draft being made by the manufacturers of synthetic rubber on our petroleum resources, particularly gasoline.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, every kind of production of synthetic rubber is a draft on the petroleum industry. For that reason we have established in the Northwest pilot plants to make synthetic gasoline. We have appropriated millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of building synthetic plants to make gasoline out of shale in Idaho, Montana, and other parts of that section of the country.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is the gentleman optimistic enough to believe that when this country has to depend on synthetic gasoline made from shale and lignite it will be available at a cost of less than a dollar a gallon?

Mr. VINSON. I hope it will not cost that much, but at least we must do what we can to bring in synthetics, outside of using up all the raw material which has come from the bosom of the earth in the way of gas.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Idaho about how large a part of petroleum production is used by the synthetic rubber industry, may I make the observation that if it be assumed that it takes a ton of petroleum to make a ton of rubber, which it does not, the drop in oil production in Texas by reason of proration

is 600,000 barrels a day, and that one simple fact, which I happen to have in mind at the moment, indicates that only a small fraction of the oil produced goes into synthetic rubber.

Mr. VINSON. Eighty-five percent of all the rubber used in the prosecution of the war was synthetic rubber, and we had at the same time a sufficient amount of petroleum to meet the war needs.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is cognizant of the very acute shortage of petroleum during the war period?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Everybody was rationed, and we could get gas only for certain things. Is the gentleman optimistic enough to think that if we have another war we will not be rationed and have another shortage?

Mr. VINSON. I think if we have another war we will be rationed not only on gasoline but on every activity of our life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Actually there was no shortage of petroleum during the war, but there was a shortage of rubber.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I consider one of the outstanding achievements of the Eightieth Congress the synthetic rubber bill presented here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. This is no time for the Government to get out of the picture. We are confronted today with a cold war. The world situation today is as acute and even more so than it was months ago. So the committee unanimously after hearing both Government witnesses and industry witnesses decided that the proper thing to do at this time in view of world conditions is to extend this law for an additional 3 years.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The purpose of this bill is to extend Public Law 469?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. That is all it does.

Mr. STEFAN. How many plants does it keep in operation?

Mr. VINSON. It will put 17 plants in actual operation.

Mr. STEFAN. In practical language and in layman's language will the gentleman tell the committee how much this operation is costing the Government and will he also tell where this rubber goes? Does it go into stockpiles?

Mr. VINSON. The answer to the gentleman's first question is that last year it was operated at a profit of a million dollars. No appropriation has ever been made for the operation of it. It is operated by chemical companies, petroleum companies and private rubber companies

on a fee system through the Office of the Rubber Reserve of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. STEFAN. What happens to the rubber after it is made?

Mr. VINSON. The law requires that at least 200,000 tons be used by the industry as well as 22,000 tons of a special type. That way the industry procures it from the Rubber Reserve of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. STEFAN. It has no relation to stockpiling?

Mr. VINSON. No, it has no relation whatsoever to stockpiling.

Mr. STEFAN. They have a revolving fund for the operation of these plants?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. They make a profit which goes into the Federal Treasury and no appropriation is made for the operation of this?

Mr. VINSON. No appropriation has been made up to this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House further. I believe everybody understands the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, anything that anyone might say at this point would be like carrying coals to Newcastle. But I do think the Members who are present will be interested to know that this is one of the most interesting and fascinating and romantic, I might say, stories that could possibly be told so far as the winning of the last war is concerned.

We came dangerously near losing the last war when Singapore fell and when the Japs, shortly after Pearl Harbor, sank two of Britain's greatest battle-ships.

Our supply of natural rubber was completely cut off. As everyone knows, rubber is almost as essential as petroleum in the fighting of modern war. It was not until Big Bill Jeffers, who is head of the Union Pacific Railroad, was brought here by President Roosevelt that we brought order out of chaos and after the expenditure of \$700,000,000 we got synthetic-rubber plants in many different sections of our country going. As the able chairman of our committee [Mr. VINSON] has told you, 85 percent of all the rubber that we used during the war years was produced synthetically here in the United States.

For many purposes this synthetic rubber is as good if not better than natural raw rubber. After the expenditure of these huge sums and through experiences that we learned—some of them painful—we found out that the United States no longer would have to depend upon foreign sources, but that we could be more or less self-sufficient and self-contained.

I want you to bear in mind that since the war ended a rubber tire is perhaps about the only commodity that you can buy as cheaply as you could before the war, although the prices have advanced in recent months.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Can the same thing be said with reference to the First World War?

Mr. SHORT. No; we did not have any synthetic rubber plants then. We were almost completely dependent upon foreign sources until we built these synthetic plants here in the United States during the recent global conflict. But today you can buy rubber as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than you could prior to the war.

I wanted merely to take this moment to offer my congratulations to the very able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], who was chairman of a subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress that considered this legislation; who worked long, arduously, and untiringly to bring about good results. There is a gentleman over in the other end of the Capitol, now a Senator from the great State of Texas, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who was then a member of our committee and who sat in the conferences that contributed much to getting this legislation passed.

I think it is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress of the United States, and if PAUL SHAFER remains here until he is as old as Uncle Joe Cannon, this one piece of legislation is worth much more than it will ever cost the taxpayers. I know his people will have the good sense to keep him here.

I think every member of our committee will agree with that. I am glad that under the guidance and direction of this almost superman, the sage of Georgia, CARL VINSON, to whom we all run when we get into trouble, that this bill drawn as it is, merely to extend and maintain the status quo for the next 2 or 3 years, will receive your approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, as has been well stated, this is merely an extension of the legislation passed in the Eightieth Congress. No changes have been made. Simply the dates of the legislation have been changed.

If the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 is allowed to expire on June 30 of this year, there will be no further production of synthetic rubber by the Government. There will be no authority to require its consumption and there will be no authority to exercise allocation controls if that should become necessary.

If the law expires the plants will become excess to the needs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and assuming they are designated by the General Services Administration as a disposal agency, they would be sold in accordance with that act. However, the facilities may revert to the General Services Administration to be sold by that agency, or the General Services Administration might permit the RFC to lease the facilities. All of this would be time-consuming and in the meantime there would be no production of synthetic rubber in this country by the Government. Remember, Government production accounts for practically all of the GRS and butyl produced in this country.

I have the figures on that. In the 1949 consumption the Government production

accounted for 299,202 tons of GRS and 50,908 tons of butyl rubber of a total production of 414,053 tons.

If the plants become excess the Secretary of Defense might declare them as essential for the natural industrial reserve and ask that they be sold or leased subject to a national security clause, and if they cannot be sold or leased subject to a national security clause, they would then be transferred to the General Services Administration to remain in standby by that agency. If we let this act expire there is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Defense, because of the tremendous strategic importance of these plants, would impose a national security clause restriction upon them and negotiations for their sale or lease would then have to proceed on that basis. Each day of delay would add to the international chaos in rubber.

Rubber is in a tight situation today and the expiration of this act would, in my opinion, practically double or possibly triple the price of natural rubber. Natural rubber is selling at 28 cents a pound on the New York market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Several months ago natural rubber was selling for 21 cents a pound. Even with the Rubber Act in existence the price of natural rubber has increased by 7 cents a pound. That leads to increased cost for rubber products for millions of American consumers. If we let this act expire the price of natural rubber will increase and the American consumer will pay through the nose; and do not forget that every increase in the price of natural rubber means a lot more that the Government must pay for the natural rubber it buys for stockpiling purposes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wonder what the gentleman's opinion is as to the effect the anticipated expiration of the Rubber Act had on the increase of the price of natural rubber from 21 cents to 28 cents? And before I finish let me say that I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Michigan in the persistent and determined effort he has made to bring about the consideration of this bill.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. In answer to his question, I think it might have had something to do with it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I, too, want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] for offering this bill. I intend to support it because of my knowl-

edge of the origin of our synthetic-rubber program at a time when we had no rubber and when we faced an emergency. Undoubtedly the members of the Committee on the Armed Services feel that this extension of this act is necessary because they feel perhaps this cold war is just a little hot; but in my opinion I think the extension of this act is absolutely necessary because it will once and for all stop the inroads of the Dutch and British monopoly which had control of natural rubber for so many, many years and whose interests endeavor to stop the passage of this kind of legislation.

This kind of legislation in my opinion not only makes it sure for the United States to have synthetic rubber and be self-sufficient during an emergency, but assures protection of the American people who buy rubber against the continuation of this international cartel by the British and Dutch monopoly which controlled rubber for so many, many years. I thank the gentleman for permitting me to make this statement.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is no question but what this law which we are about to extend, if Congress accepts this bill, has been a successful law.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the gentleman one more question? In the manufacture of GSR butyl and butadiene, what percentage of farm products are used? What percentage of farm products are being used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber today?

Mr. SHAFER. I would not be able to tell the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield at that point, we make synthetic rubber from petroleum products, from gas, and from alcohol from farm products.

Mr. SHAFER. We have one alcohol plant.

Mr. SHORT. We could take care of your surplus corn crop up in Nebraska.

Mr. SHAFER. And potatoes.

Mr. SHORT. And potatoes. The gentleman from Michigan, I may say, was chairman of the subcommittee on which I was privileged to serve which investigated this subject. The members of the Armed Services Committee are deeply grateful to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] who was so helpful in the preparation of this legislation; and we never could have accomplished what we did without the splendid assistance of our staff member, Mr. Russell Blanford.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. May I say as majority leader that I know no one who has been more wholesomely pressing upon me to have this bill programed and taken up than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 has been a successful law. Industry says it is all right. Government witnesses finally admitted it was all right, and it does assure us of a source of rubber, which is of tremendous importance to the Nation. I am sure that the House knows that I am as much opposed to controls of any type as anyone in the United States. I would like to see the Government out of business just as the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee would like to see Government out of business. But like him, I believe that this is an exception and that our national security demands the extension of the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948.

Some people might claim that the large demand for synthetic rubber justifies the sale of the synthetic rubber facilities. But we have never been able to test this issue by a gradual reduction of specification controls. Our report suggests that procedure. We look upon this as a one-package deal. Butyl and GRS are both part of the synthetic rubber program. We do not feel that we can release one and not the other. No one is being injured by the Government's retention of these facilities, and the next 3 years should determine whether or not both types of synthetic rubber have the ability to stand on their own feet.

I urge the House to pass this bill and extend a good law passed during the Eightieth Congress which may mean a great deal to you and to every American citizen if we should be faced with a sudden emergency.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, because I have the honor of representing Akron, Ohio, the rubber capital of the world, I have a very great interest in the pending legislation. I have listened attentively to the statements that have been made, especially by my colleague and good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] about the necessity of this country always having an adequate supply of rubber.

I am reminded that the late Harvey S. Firestone, founder of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., many years before we thought of synthetic rubber, stated that America should produce its own rubber. Had that splendid and wise advice been followed we might not have found ourselves so handicapped following Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a brief word of commendation to the well-deserved praise that has been directed to the Armed Services Committee for its work on the rubber problem in both this and the Eightieth Congress.

I should also like to comment briefly upon the radical change which has taken place in the rubber supply picture since this committee completed its hearings 2 months ago.

In its report, the committee recognized and in strong and clear language dwelt upon the desirability of reducing mandatory or government-enforced use of

synthetic rubber as soon as possible. It also urged that it be the policy of the Government to supply all of the synthetic rubber required over the mandatory minimum and sought by private industry for consumption on a voluntary basis.

The wisdom of this policy has become abundantly clear within the past 5 weeks. For we are suddenly confronted with a runaway market in natural rubber touched off by new evidence of a serious world shortage of natural rubber that threatens to continue for many years. New estimates brought back to this country only this week by American delegates to the International Rubber Study Group Conference in Brussels bring out the fact that these shortages are even more acute today than we had estimated them to be one short month ago.

Thus the matter of mandatory consumption has become a purely academic question for this year and probably for the next 2 or 3 years at least. It would thus appear that security would in no way be jeopardized by the substantial reduction of mandatory requirements.

Even now the Government is unable with its present operating plants to meet the demands of the rubber manufacturing industry in this country for synthetic rubber.

For these reasons I would like to add to the recommendations of the committee my own view that it is important that the Government agency operating these plants do all within its power to meet the requirements of American industry for synthetic rubber, even to the point of opening new plants. To the extent that this demand is not met and the industry is compelled to use exorbitantly priced natural rubber, the American public will be compelled to pay millions of dollars more for its rubber products.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I was called from the Chamber on official business pertaining to the Canadian River project when the roll call was had on the passage of the Federal Highway Act. I wish to make the statement that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words for the purpose of ascertaining, if I can, from my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday and Tuesday:

H. R. 8567, the deficiency bill, 1950.

H. R. 8568, District of Columbia Appropriation bill, 1951.

Conference report on ECA, which will be the first order of business on Tuesday without regard to what disposition may be made on Monday of the other two appropriation bills.

House Resolution 503, the Stevens-Blackney contested election case.

I have been requested not to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.

On that day there will be considered:

H. R. 4424, Alaska settlement by war veterans.

H. R. 6152, Indians, Devils Lake Sioux Tribe.

H. R. 7262, Indians, Turtle Mountain Band. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is very much interested in those bills.

After Calendar Wednesday the following bills will be considered during the remainder of the week and while the list may be long most of these bills will not take much time and if not disposed of they will go over until the following week:

H. R. 6826, extension of the Selective Service Act, 1948.

H. R. 7764, the naval construction bill. S. 2440, installations, Military Establishment.

H. R. 7273, Civil government for Guam.

H. R. 5990, the Baltimore-Washington Parkway bill, which was considered the other day but final action thereon not taken.

S. 2128, royalty-free licenses.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and with the usual notation, which might produce a smile, any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, if no other Members desire to avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on this bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have received from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, together with a tabulation and copies of letters I have sent today to the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning from the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, a further tabu-

lation of the quantities of food commodities distributed as of May 17, broken down by States. This is under the provisions of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and section 3, Public Law 471.

A preliminary study of this tabulation indicates that the same general pattern of distribution prevails and that again Illinois ranges far ahead of all other States.

One million five hundred forty-two thousand seven hundred and fifty-two pounds of butter are consigned to Illinois. The total assigned to all 48 States and the four island possessions is 5,361,012 pounds. In other words, Illinois is receiving more than 28 percent of the total of this food commodity.

It is interesting to note that Illinois alone received 49,056 more pounds of butter than the butter assigned to the 11 Northeastern States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. In contrast to that, according to the latest official information, those States have a combined population of 40,872,000 against Illinois' population of 8,397,000.

I was advised this morning that the latest official figures on unemployment show that these 11 Northeastern States had 767,043 unemployed, while Illinois had 161,375. Surely the comparative situation with reference to unemployment is one measure by which the fairness and reasonableness of this current program of distributing food commodities can be measured. On its face there is rank discrimination, whatever the cause or reason.

I have sent a copy of this statement to the President and to Secretary Brannan. The explanation that some States are not in a position financially to participate in this program points up sharply the imperative necessity of immediate action along the lines which have been recommended repeatedly to the President and to the Secretary of Agriculture. How much longer must the needy people in all parts of this country wait for fair treatment?

I now want to include the letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator and the enclosed tabulation:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1950.
Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Attached is the table which your office requested by telephone, setting forth the quantities of commodities the States have ordered under the provisions of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and section 3 of Public Law 471.

Please note that the accumulated figure for section 416 potatoes is less than was previously reported in our letter of May 11, 1950. This is the result of recent cancellations received from several States.

Sincerely yours,
ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Acting Assistant Administrator.

Orders placed as of May 17

[In pounds]

State	Sec. 416 commodities					Sec. 3, Public Law 471, Irish potatoes (1949 crop)
	Butter	Cheese	Dried eggs	Nonfat dry milk solids	Irish potatoes	
Alabama.....	18,816	25,270	22,568	157,825	862,800	468,000
Arizona.....	20,800	26,810	29,960	40,000	182,000	792,000
Arkansas.....	26,432	20,300	22,400	45,000	1,026,000	1,584,000
California.....	79,616	63,540	102,088	79,950	3,914,000	274,900
Colorado.....	63,296	11,760	4,375		1,880,200	400,000
Connecticut.....					765,000	135,000
Delaware.....	21,120	7,000	4,760	47,400	288,000	322,000
District of Columbia.....	32,640	12,250	10,808	20,475	216,000	
Florida.....	20,032	20,020	19,432	41,925	980,350	
Georgia.....	74,752	49,350	10,584	29,600	1,034,250	18,900
Idaho.....	256	140	504	5,825	230,430	6,845,000
Illinois.....	1,542,752	762,067	481,115	960,425	3,373,000	708,000
Indiana.....					233,200	493,100
Iowa.....	56,000	20,510	2,275	3,150	1,207,900	393,000
Kansas.....	74,560	21,140			141,400	915,000
Kentucky.....	90,816	43,120	13,699	29,425	654,000	936,000
Louisiana.....	72,000	24,500		30,000	378,000	282,100
Maine.....		28,350	35,280	87,075	1,088,200	771,000
Maryland.....	39,616	49,000	6,048	55,950	1,071,300	2,350,000
Massachusetts.....	147,840	71,820	3,360	68,075	2,770,000	2,298,300
Michigan.....	183,232	160,790			3,205,800	1,152,000
Minnesota.....	119,040	68,020			1,850,900	
Mississippi.....	37,120	24,570		3,600	285,000	1,395,000
Missouri.....	112,640	53,370	64,544	78,825	1,422,000	36,000
Montana.....	15,376	4,660		15,750	124,400	262,000
Nebraska.....	49,600	16,520			865,200	42,100
Nevada.....	4,736	1,610	1,050	1,250	79,200	529,000
New Hampshire.....	65,620	34,790	17,360	39,000	324,000	1,900,000
New Jersey.....	143,040	46,620	51,856	201,825	491,800	180,000
New Mexico.....	1,088	490	56,476	78,750	432,000	5,013,000
New York.....	601,856	193,900	115,640	483,500	4,187,400	990,000
North Carolina.....			4,326	22,275	485,900	780,000
North Dakota.....	7,680	3,150	336	800	286,100	3,326,000
Ohio.....	502,292	263,970	135,625	196,500	3,459,100	648,000
Oklahoma.....	57,088	23,800	32,032		1,638,000	6,000
Oregon.....	36,160	12,180	224	23,800	153,500	3,922,000
Pennsylvania.....	432,064	230,300	294,392	945,275	7,094,600	718,000
Rhode Island.....	21,120	23,940		22,500	680,000	300,000
South Carolina.....			525	1,125	616,000	604,500
South Dakota.....			5,936	9,745	1,058,100	1,365,000
Tennessee.....	75,456	47,600	11,935	1,000	432,000	1,044,000
Texas.....	61,952	44,590	1,960	66,160	2,507,500	14,500
Utah.....	83,008	90,160	16,968	50,125	1,646,800	50,000
Vermont.....	21,120	7,490		14,000	307,900	1,350,000
Virginia.....	93,888	49,630	1,589	12,600	474,000	379,700
Washington.....	75,136	36,540	1,453	105,445	1,011,550	1,900,000
West Virginia.....	84,480	95,760	235,144	330,600	3,203,000	1,125,000
Wisconsin.....	59,712	20,020	9,520	11,250	1,017,400	9,700
Wyoming.....	8,448	2,870	3,472	66,600	523,000	136,000
Alaska.....	28,416					
Total.....	5,361,012	2,814,317	1,831,619	4,484,400	62,199,180	49,053,800

¹ Freight paid to Seattle only.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude with the letter I sent today to the President and state that I sent an identical letter to Secretary Brannan. The letter is as follows:

MAY 19, 1950.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose a statement which is self-explanatory.

In the face of the facts which are now developing as to this program of distributing surplus food commodities to needy people, surely prompt action should be taken to remedy the obvious inequities.

Respectfully,

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a tribute to motherhood, given by Drew Pearson over a national radio hook-up last Sunday.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and include in one an address by the Assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor, and in the other a eulogy delivered by the Most Reverend John H. Wright at the requiem mass for the Right Reverend Walter S. Carroll, D. C., in St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., on February 27, last.

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and include in one extracts from certain letters and telegrams and in the other an address by Hon. STEPHEN PACE, of Georgia.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include speeches in one of them and excerpts in the other.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LARCADE, for three legislative days, on account of accompanying the Vice President on a visit to Louisiana.

To Mr. THOMPSON, for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. FUGATE, for Monday, May 22, on account of official business.

To Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. HORAN), for today, on account of official business.

To Mrs. WOODHOUSE (at the request of Mr. BIEMILLER), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4433. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.;

H. R. 4732. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6171. An act to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1460. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report of the activities of the General Accounting Office, pursuant to section 16 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a copy of the order of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subject of such order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1462. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit national banks to give security in the form required by State law for deposits of funds by local public agencies and officers"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1463. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1464. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 28, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of channels to and near Jefferson Islands, Chesapeake Bay, Md., with a view to their establishment as an aid to navigation and the establishment of a harbor of refuge, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1465. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Intracoastal Waterway from

Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., with a view to providing an auxiliary side channel from the Intracoastal Waterway near Titusville through, and easterly of, Merritt Island via Banana Creek and River to, or near, Eau Gallie, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1466. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Illinois River and Lake Depue, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 8, 1945, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee of conference. H. R. 1285. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor (Rept. No. 2111). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILES: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2274. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to El Morro National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes: without amendment (Rept. No. 2112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8567. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8568. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 476. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8276. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee of conference. H. R. 7797. A bill to provide foreign economic assistance (Rept. No. 2117). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8565. A bill to make capital and credit more readily available for financing small business, foster competition, and coordinate Federal aids to small business, and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic

and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8566. A bill to make capital and credit more readily available for financing small business, foster competition, and coordinate Federal aids to small business, and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 8567. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 8568. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8569. A bill to strengthen the common defense by extending for 5 years the authority for the Texas City tin smelter operation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 8570. A bill to strengthen the common defense by extending for 5 years the authority for the Texas City tin smelter operation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8571. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife-refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 8572. A bill to amend paragraph 1793 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 8573. A bill to provide for the consideration and payment of claims against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for livestock slaughter subsidy payments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8574. A bill authorizing the Attorney General to incorporate certain nonprofit nonpolitical organizations, including those composed solely of veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8575. A bill to provide emergency cotton allotments to producers of farm commodities whose 1950 crops have been substantially destroyed by natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8576. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8577. A bill to prohibit the establishment or maintenance of certain area officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8578. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year

1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. Res. 606. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 607. Resolution making H. R. 2146, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 8579. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 8580. A bill for the relief of Yingnan Hoo, Mesum Hoo, and Meguen Hoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 8581. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Higuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8582. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 8583. A bill for the relief of Hisako Shimizu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 8584. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tokio Sato Keating, Terry Yoichi Keating, and Betty Jean Keating; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 8585. A bill for the relief of Athena Mary Onasses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2153. By Mr. HOLMES: Resolution of Columbia Basin School Development Association, signed by superintendents of schools and members of school boards of Grand Coulee, Coulee City, Soap Lake, Ephrata, Quincy, Moses Lake, Warden, Othello, Connell, Pasco, Lind, and Eltopia, endorsing House bills 8113 and 7940; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2154. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Somerset County Farm Bureau, Princess Anne, Md., urging Congress to make effective the recommendations of the Hoover Commission by enacting appropriate legislation in cooperation with the educational program of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2155. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of Dewey Heichel Post, No. 4907, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wellsboro, Pa., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.